Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

99 28 JUN 30 1999

No.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN; PAUL K.H. FIGGE, JR., M.D.; WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND,

Petitioners,

v.

KIMBERLY SCHREIBER, a minor by her guardian ad litem, JOHN KRUEGER; GERALD SCHREIBER and JANICE SCHREIBER,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TIMOTHY J. STRATTNER
Counsel of Record
PAUL J. KELLY
LINDA V. MEAGHER
SCHELLINGER & DOYLE, S.C.
Attorneys for Petitioner Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund
445 South Moorland Road
Suite 450
P.O. Box 464
Brookfield, WI 53008
(414) 785-0200

153350

Counsel Press LLC
FORMERLY LUTZ APPELLATE SERVICES
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in this proceeding violate Dr. Figge's right of self-determination, which is a constitutionally protected liberty interest under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, by forcing him to perform a procedure that he did not believe was medically appropriate?

LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund is a defendant below. Physicians Insurance Company of Wisconsin and Paul K.H. Figge, Jr., M.D., join in the petition and are defendants below. The State of Wisconsin and Employers Health Insurance Company are defendants below, but were not party to the appeal in the Wisconsin appellate courts.

Respondents Kimberly Schreiber and her parents, Janice and Gerald Schreiber, are the plaintiffs below.

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 29.6

The petition accurately lists the parties to the proceeding.

Petitioners have no parent corporations and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of their stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question Presented	i
List of Parties	ii
Statement Pursuant to Rule 29.6	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Table of Cited Authorities	vi
Table of Appendices	viii
Opinions Below	1
Statement of Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional Right Involved	2
Statement of the Case	2
A. Introduction	2
B. Factual Background	3
C. Summary of Proceedings Below	7
1. Trial Court's Decision.	7
2. Decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals.	9

Contents

Page

3. Decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. 12

Reasons for Granting the Writ 14

I. Doctors, As Well As Patients, Have A Right To Self-Determination As A Constitutionally Protected Liberty Interest. 14

A. The Right to Self-Determination Protects the Integrity of One's Own Body. 15

B. The Right of Self-Determination Protects a Wisconsin Doctor, as Well as Patients, From Being Compelled to Do Something Against His or Her Will. .. 16

II. Informed Consent Law Should Not Compel A Doctor To Perform A Procedure That Is Not Medically Appropriate. 17

A. Dr. Figge Risked Committing Medical Malpractice By Proceeding With Mrs. Schreiber's Demands. 18

B. Dr. Figge Will Not Be the Only Wisconsin Doctor Who Loses His Right to Self-Determination. 19

Contents

		Page
C.	The Supreme Court Decision Compels the Doctor to Perform Whatever Procedure is Demanded, as Long as It is a Viable Medical Option.	19
D.	Withdrawal as the Physician Is Not A Possibility For Avoiding the Problem.	22
Conclusion		23

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, Inc., 462 U.S. 416 (1983) 15, 16

Canterbury v. Spence, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1064 (1972) 16

Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990) 14, 15, 16

Hurtado v. People of California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884) 15

Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977) 15

Maher v. Roe, 432 U.S. 464 (1977) 15

Martin v. Richards, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995) 3, 10

Nowatske v. Osterloh, 198 Wis. 2d 419, 543 N.W.2d 265 (1996) 20

Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) 16

Rust v. Sullivan, 500 U.S. 173 (1991) 15

Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975) 3, 10

Cited Authorities

	Page
Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757 (1966)	16
Union Pac. R. Co. v. Botsford, 141 U.S. 250 (1891)	15
Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)	16
Winston v. Lee, 470 U.S. 753 (1985)	16
Statutes:	
Wisconsin Statutes:	
sec. 448.30	3
sec. 655.23(4)	1
sec. 655.27(1)	1
28 U.S.C. § 1257	2
Wisconsin Administrative Code, sec. Med. 18.02(3)	20
United States Constitution:	
Fourteenth Amendment	i, 2, 14, 15, 16
Other Authority:	
Random House Unabridged Dictionary 972 (2d ed. 1993)	20

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Page

Appendix A — Opinion Of The Supreme Court Of Wisconsin Dated And Decided January 26, 1999 ..... 1a

Appendix B — Opinion Of The Wisconsin Court Of Appeals Dated And Decided February 17, 1998 ..... 22a

Appendix C — Amended Order For Judgment And Judgment Of The Circuit Court For The State Of Wisconsin, Oneida County Dated November 20, 1996 And Filed November 22, 1996 ..... 44a

Appendix D — Decision, Findings Of Fact, Conclusions Of Law And Judgment Of The Circuit Court For The State Of Wisconsin, Oneida County Dated September 24, 1996 ..... 47a

Appendix E — Order Of The Wisconsin Supreme Court Denying Motion For Reconsideration Dated April 7, 1999 ..... 71a

Petitioner the Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund,[1] respectfully requests that a Writ of Certiorari be issued to review the opinion of the Wisconsin Supreme Court entered in this proceeding.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Wisconsin Supreme Court is reported at *Schreiber v. Physicians Insurance Co.*, 223 Wis. 2d 417, 588 N.W.2d 26 (1999) and reprinted in the Appendix hereto at App. A, page 1a. The order of the Wisconsin Supreme Court denying the motion for rehearing is not published. It is reprinted in the Appendix hereto at App. E, page 71a.

The opinion of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals is reported at *Schreiber v. Physicians Insurance Co.*, 217 Wis. 2d 94, 579 N.W.2d 730 (Ct. App. 1998) and is reprinted in the Appendix hereto at App. B, page 22a. The circuit court decision and order for judgment are not published. However, they are reprinted in the Appendix hereto at App. C and D.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

On January 26, 1999, the Wisconsin Supreme Court issued its opinion in this proceeding. On April 7, 1999, the supreme court denied a timely petition for rehearing.

---

1. The Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund is a statutorily created entity that is required to pay that portion of any medical malpractice claim against a participating health care provider, which exceeds the statutorily mandated primary liability insurance policy. *See* sec. 655.27(1), Wis. Stats. In this case, the Fund is required to pay all damages in excess of $300,000. *See* sec. 655.23(4), Wis. Stats. Damages have not been decided, but given the claimed injuries, they will far exceed the primary limits.

The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT INVOLVED

The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in this proceeding significantly interferes with Dr. Figge's right to self-determination. The right of self-determination is a liberty interest protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . . ."

The supreme court decision holds that Dr. Figge, and all Wisconsin physicians in the future, have a duty to perform medical procedures, and provide medical treatments, on demand. Under the guise of informed consent law, Wisconsin now makes it mandatory for a doctor to physically provide any viable medical treatment, even when the doctor believes that the treatment is not appropriate under the circumstances or is opposed to performing the procedure for some other reason. The decisional law strips Wisconsin doctors of their right of self-determination. If a patient demands a procedure, the doctor must perform it or face liability under Wisconsin's informed consent law.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Introduction

To satisfy Wisconsin's informed consent law, before the supreme court's decision in this case, Wisconsin

physicians were required to inform their patients of the advantages and risks of a procedure, the viable options, and to perform only those procedures for which a patient had consented. *See* sec. 448.30, Wis. Stats; *Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995); *Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975). Now, the informed consent law, under the decision in this case, requires Wisconsin doctors to provide treatment on demand, in addition to obtaining an informed consent.

Doctors no longer have the right of self-determination, when faced with a demand from a patient. A doctor may no longer decide what procedure is medically appropriate in his or her judgment. Instead, the doctor must perform the demanded procedure as long as it is a viable medical option, or face liability under the informed consent law.

While a patient has a right of bodily integrity, so has a physician. A patient has a right to refuse or receive medical treatment. A doctor should also have a right to decide whether or not to perform a procedure, or to provide a specific treatment. Unfortunately, the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision takes away that right.

B. Factual Background

The factual issue in this case was whether or not the defendant Dr. Figge obtained an informed consent from plaintiff Janice Schreiber to proceed with an attempted vaginal delivery, as opposed to a cesarean section. (At the time of trial, there was no medical malpractice claim. The Schreibers were not alleging that Dr. Figge misdiagnosed Mrs. Schreiber's condition, nor were they alleging that he had breached the standard of care by failing to perform the cesarean sooner).

On June 25, 1988, the plaintiff, Janice Schreiber, gave birth to her third child, Kimberly. *See* App. D, at 49a-50a. Before giving birth to Kimberly, Mrs. Schreiber had delivered two other children, both by cesarean section. *See Schreiber*, 217 Wis. 2d at 98; App. B at 23a. The first cesarean was performed on November 9, 1981, because of insufficient progress in labor after seventeen hours. *Id.*; App. D, at 48a. A second cesarean was performed to deliver Mrs. Schreiber's second child, on February 13, 1984, because at that time, it was the standard of care to perform an elective repeat cesarean (in accordance with the " 'once a cesarean always a cesarean' rule.") *Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 421; App. A, at page 3a. Dr. Figge served as Mrs. Schreiber's obstetrician during both pregnancies and performed both cesareans. *Id.* at 420; App. A at 2a.

Satisfied with Dr. Figge's care, Mrs. Schreiber returned to him when she became pregnant for the third time in 1987. In 1987 and 1988, the prevailing medical research and practice suggested that a vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC) was no more dangerous than undergoing another cesarean birth. *Id.* at 421; App. A at 3a. In fact, the research showed that the VBAC presented less risk than the cesarean.[2] *Id.*

During Mrs. Schreiber's prenatal care, she and Dr. Figge discussed the possibility of a vaginal delivery as an alternative to a third cesarean. *Id.* (The medical records

2. Medical literature at that time suggested that physicians encourage their patients to have a vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC), because vaginal deliveries had fewer risks than a cesarean; that 60 percent of women who attempted vaginal delivery were successful; and the risk of uterine ruptures (the fear previously prompting repeat caesareans) had shown that the right of uterine ruptures were successful.

reflect that the two discussed the topic on at least four separate occasions during Mrs. Schreiber's appointments.) After being given a choice between the cesarean and a vaginal delivery, Mrs. Schreiber chose the vaginal delivery. *Id.* Mrs. Schreiber testified that Dr. Figge offered her the option but did not attempt to influence her decision either way. The trial court concluded that Mrs. Schreiber had given her informed consent to the VBAC, before her labor began. *Schreiber*, 217 Wis. 2d at 101; App. B at 27a. This finding was not appealed. *See id.*; *See also Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 428; App. A at 11a.

Mrs. Schreiber began experiencing labor pains in the evening of June 24, 1988. App. D at 49a. She was admitted to the hospital at about 4 a.m. on June 25. *Id.* Dr. Figge first saw Mrs. Schreiber at the hospital, in the corridor, four hours later, at about 8:00 a.m. At that time, Mrs. Schreiber told Dr. Figge that she had changed her mind and that she wanted a cesarean. *Id.* Dr. Figge told Mrs. Schreiber that they should return to her room so that he could examine her. *Id.*

Because the progress in Mrs. Schreiber's dilation was limited, Dr. Figge performed an amniotomy, the breaking of the mother's amniotic fluid sac, to help the labor progress more efficiently. *Id.* Shortly thereafter, Mrs. Schreiber began experiencing severe upper epigastric pain. *Id.* She was given pain medication at 9:30 a.m., which provided limited relief. *Id.*

At 1:00 p.m., Dr. Figge returned to Mrs. Schreiber's room and examined her. *Id.* He also attempted to ascertain the source of Mrs. Schreiber's pain. Dr. Figge concluded that the baby was not in distress. The amniotic fluid was

clear, with no evidence of a bleed. Mrs. Schreiber's abdomen was soft, and her uterus was not tender. Mrs. Schreiber's pain was not in the area of her uterus. Given the symptoms, Dr. Figge did not believe that Mrs. Schreiber had a ruptured uterus.[3] Dr. Figge concluded that neither Mrs. Schreiber's uterus nor her placenta was the source of the pain. He advised Mrs. Schreiber of his conclusion. Mrs. Schreiber testified that she again asked for a cesarean. *Id.* at 49a. Dr. Figge told Mrs. Schreiber to give the vaginal delivery more time. *Id.*

Mrs. Schreiber again requested a cesarean and, according to Mrs. Schreiber, Dr. Figge responded something to the effect of "If I gave every woman a cesarean who was in labor, they would all want one." *Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 422; App. A at 5a. Mrs. Schreiber claims that she stopped talking due to Dr. Figge's comment, which she perceived as brusque and which also hurt her feelings.

At about 1:45 p.m., Dr. Figge returned to Mrs. Schreiber's room. *Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 423; App. A at 5a; App. D at 64a. He told her that her contractions were not strong enough. He also advised her that he would be administering Pitocin, a drug which stimulates effective labor, to augment the labor process. Dr. Figge told Mrs. Schreiber if the labor did not progress with the Pitocin, he would then perform a cesareans.

---

3. If a patient has a uterine rupture, the uterus itself would be tender. Also, the leakage of fluid or blood into the abdominal cavity would result in the abdomen feeling hard. Mrs. Schreiber did not show these symptoms. If the placenta was separating from the uterus, the early symptom would be pain near the uterus, which Mrs. Schreiber did not exhibit. Some women in labor complain of pain not associated with contractions, and the cause is not always discovered. App. D at 66a.

Dr. Figge testified that he thought Mrs. Schreiber had agreed with his plan and recommendation. Mrs. Schreiber did not refuse the treatment. Pitocin was started and administered at a low level at 1:48 p.m. The dose was increased every 20 minutes, and by 3:00 p.m., Mrs. Schreiber was receiving 8 milliunits of Pitocin. The maximum dose allowable was 20 milliunits.

Dr. Figge examined Mrs. Schreiber at 2:45. Her abdomen remained soft, and she did not have tenderness near her uterus. She did, however, continue to complain of epigastric pain.

At 3:00 p.m., Mrs. Schreiber received an epidural anesthetic. At 3:40 p.m., the fetal heart rate dropped. *See id.* at 423; App. A at 5a. This required an emergency cesarean shortly after 4 p.m. *Id.* Kimberly Schreiber was born a spastic quadriplegic. *Id.*

C. Summary of Proceedings Below

The Schreiber's initial claim against Dr. Figge alleged both medical malpractice and a violation of the informed consent statute. App. D at 50a. Before trial, however, the Schreibers dropped the malpractice claim. *Id.* Therefore, the issue was not whether or not Dr. Figge's conduct was appropriate, but rather whether or not Mrs. Schreiber had given her informed consent.

1. *Trial Court's Decision.*

The parties stipulated to a court trial on liability on the informed consent issue. (The parties also stipulated that had a cesarean been performed before 3:29 p.m., Kimberly's injuries would not have occurred). *Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 423; App. A at 5a.

The circuit court ruled in favor of Dr. Figge. The circuit court found that Mrs. Schreiber had given her informed consent to a VBAC, that nothing had occurred during the course of Mrs. Schreiber's labor that altered the labor to require a new consent, and that a reasonable person in the position of Mrs. Schreiber would have followed Dr. Figge's advice and continued with labor (which is exactly what Mrs. Schreiber had done). App. D at 60a and 69a-70a. The trial court's findings required the dismissal of the plaintiffs' claims.

The trial court, in its opinion, pointed out the complexities of the case:

> This has been an unusually difficult case, primarily because of the blurring of the lines between diagnosis or medical management on the one hand and informed consent on the other.

Id. at 52a. (The opinion of the Wisconsin Supreme Court ultimately blurred the lines between the two separate and distinct theories of liability).

The circuit court concluded that "once the procedure elected has been initiated, . . . a request for a change does not thereby require an informed consent discussion. At [that] point the election has been made and the procedure in progress." *Id.* at 62a. As Dr. Figge testified, "his duty was to manage her labor and to help her achieve her goal as long as it was safe." *Id.*

> [F]ollowing an informed consent to a specific treatment procedure, once the procedure has commenced, the duty of the doctor is to seek to

> achieve its goal, but if the situation changes to increase the risks presented to the patient and there are alternative, viable medical modes of treatment available, then a renewed [informed consent] discussion . . . needs to take place.

Id. at 63a. Since Mrs. Schreiber had been informed of the risks and advantages of the VBAC, and had consented to it, the informed consent law was satisfied. Nothing new or different had occurred during the labor that had not been discussed during the original informed consent discussion between Mrs. Schreiber and Dr. Figge. *See id.* at 66a. Mrs. Schreiber, before the procedure began (i.e. the vaginal delivery) had been advised of the risks, and complications. (The issue of a violation of the standard of care, for not performing the procedure requested by the plaintiff, or for misdiagnosing the condition, is a different issue. That involves the standard of care under the circumstances. It does not involved the doctrine of informed consent. *See id.* at 67a).

2. *Decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals.*

The Schreibers appealed the trial court's judgment, which had dismissed their informed consent claim. On appeal, as in the trial court, Dr. Figge, his insurer and the Fund [hereinafter collectively referred to as "Dr. Figge"] argued that requiring a physician to perform a surgery demanded by the patient interferes with the physician's right to self-determination. The physician should not be compelled against his or her will to perform a procedure, or provide medical treatment, that the doctor does not wish to perform or provide.

On February 17, 1998, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals issued its opinion, which reversed the trial court judgment. *See* App. B at 22a; *Schreiber*, 217 Wis. 2d 94, 579 N.W.2d 730 (Ct. App. 1998). In a two to one decision by the three member court, the majority of the court of appeals held that Dr. Figge had violated the informed consent law by not performing the cesarean when requested by Mrs. Schreiber.

One of the three court of appeals' judges, Judge Myse, wrote a dissenting opinion. *See Schreiber*, 217 Wis. 2d at 111 (Myse, J., dissenting); App. B at 38a. Judge Myse concluded that the majority decision violated Dr. Figge's right to self-determination. *See Id.* at 113; App. B at 41a. Judge Myse pointed out that Wisconsin's informed consent statute provides that:

> Any physician who treats a patient shall inform the patient about the availability of all alternate, viable medical modes of treatment and about the benefits and risks of these treatments. The physician's duty is to inform the patient. . . .

Id. at 111; App. B at 39a (quoting sec. 448.30, Wis. Stats.) *See also Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 173-74, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995); *Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975). Judge Myse also noted that "[t]he Wisconsin informed consent statute cannot be fairly read to compel either Figge or any other doctor to perform a treatment the doctor does not believe is medically indicated." *Id.* at 112; App. at 40a.

Judge Myse further noted that "[t]he plain language of the informed consent statute merely requires the doctor to provide the patient with information sufficient to allow the

patient to either consent or withhold consent to the doctor's proposed medical treatment." *Id.* "The plain language of the informed consent statute and [the common law] demonstrate that there was no intent to require a doctor to perform medical treatment on demand. Figge should not be held liable for failing to do so here." *Id.* at 113; App. B at 40a. Judge Myse reasoned that the court of appeals' decision compelled "a doctor to perform a treatment the doctor does not believe is medically indicated and does not want to do." *Id.* at 113; App. B at 41a.

The dissenting opinion also highlighted the problem with the rule adopted here:

> Figge's refusal to perform the cesarean was based on his belief that it was bad medical practice to perform a cesarean based on complaints of pain alone. If his medical judgment concerning the appropriateness of a cesarean was incorrect, Figge may be liable in a medical malpractice claim. But Figge's refusal to carry out a treatment that he believes is contraindicated does not implicate the informed consent statute.

Id. at 113-14 (App. B at 41a).

After a complete informed consent conference during her prenatal care, Mrs. Schreiber chose a VBAC as the course of treatment for her delivery, instead of a repeat cesarean. Given Mrs. Schreiber's decision, Dr. Figge proceeded as he would with any other patient who had chosen that option. Dr. Figge believed, in his medical judgment, that it was inappropriate to perform a cesarean based upon pain alone. Dr. Figge could be held liable for

medical malpractice if his medical judgment concerning the appropriateness of a cesarean was incorrect. *Id.*; App. B at 41a. However, Dr. Figge's decision not to perform a procedure that he believes is contraindicated "does not implicate the informed consent statute." *Id.* at 114; App. B at 41a. Judge Myse correctly pointed out that the informed consent law obligates a physician to explain all viable, medical modes of treatment. *Id.* "This recognizes that there may be a number of feasible approaches to a specific medical problem. But simply because a medical procedure is feasible does not make such a procedure preferable or even desirable." *Id.*; App. B at 41a-42a. "The doctor should retain the right to refuse to follow a course of treatment that contravenes the doctor's opinion as to proper medical practice and procedure." *Id.*; App. B at 42a. Any other result places the doctor in the position of violating the informed consent law, by not performing the procedure demanded, or committing medical malpractice, by proceeding with the demanded procedure.

3. *Decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court.*

Dr. Figge appealed the court of appeals' decision to the Wisconsin Supreme Court. There, as in the court of appeals, Dr. Figge argued that a rule requiring him to perform a procedure, or provide treatment, that he did not believe should be performed, violated his self-determination rights. The supreme court, however, issued a decision that did not address the violation of Dr. Figge's right to self-determination.

In its decision, the Wisconsin Supreme Court held that Dr. Figge had violated the informed consent law. Contrary to the circuit court's findings, the supreme court found that

Mrs. Schreiber had withdrawn her consent to the VBAC, while in labor. *See Schreiber*, 223 Wis. 2d at 430; App. A at 13a. The supreme court further found that the withdrawal of consent both removed Dr. Figge's authority to continue with the VBAC and "obligated him to conduct another informed consent discussion." *Id.* "The function of withdrawal, in effect, places [Mrs. Schreiber] and [Dr.] Figge in their original position-a physician, a patient and a series of options for treatment. It creates a blank slate on which the parties must again diagram their plan." *Id.* at 431; App. A at 14a. The supreme court did not address the fact that Dr. Figge, in his own medical judgment, believed that a cesarean was not an appropriate course for pain alone. (The fact that the cesarean may or may have remained a "viable" option during the course of labor was not relevant to that issue).

The supreme court included a "cautionary note" in its opinion.

> [T]his opinion should not be interpreted as creating a patient's right to demand any treatment she desires. Further, this opinion should not be interpreted as requiring physicians to perform procedures they do not consider medically viable, procedures for which they lack the appropriate expertise, or procedures to which they are morally opposed.

Unfortunately, the concerns addressed in the "cautionary" comment are precisely the result reached by the court.

The supreme court's decision blurs the line between a claim of informed consent and a claim of medical

negligence. In so doing, it took away Wisconsin doctors' right of self-determination. Now, when faced with a demand for a specific treatment, the doctor must perform it.

The Fund filed a timely motion for rehearing with the supreme court. It was denied.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision is bad public policy. Not only does it significantly interfere with Dr. Figge's right of self-determination, it has dire consequences for all physicians in Wisconsin. Wisconsin doctors, under the decisional rule, are compelled to physically perform a procedure, or to provide medical treatment, simply because the patient demands it. The supreme court's decision significantly interferes with a doctor's constitutionally protected right of self-determination.

I. DOCTORS, AS WELL AS PATIENTS, HAVE A RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION AS A CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED LIBERTY INTEREST.

This lawsuit began as a discussion of patients' rights. Ironically, it resulted in stripping doctors of their rights. Dr. Figge's right to self determination was taken away.

The right of self-determination mandates that no court, government or entity should substitute its judgment for that of another person's judgment with regard to that person's own bodily integrity. The right to self determination is rooted in the liberty right of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 269 (1990). The Fourteenth

Amendment provides that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." The right to self-determination is an outgrowth of the historic liberty interest in personal security and bodily integrity. *See Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651, 673 (1977); *Union Pac. R. Co. v. Botsford*, 141 U.S. 250, 252 (1891). It is a constitutionally protected autonomy right. Each man or woman is considered to be master of his or her own body.

A. The Right to Self-Determination Protects the Integrity of One's Own Body.

As early as 1884, the Supreme Court recognized that the liberty right of the Fourteenth Amendment protected the integrity of one's own body. *Hurtado v. People of California*, 110 U.S. 516, 536 (1884). In 1891, the Supreme Court explicitly stated that " '[n]o right is more sacred, or is more carefully guarded, by the common law, than the right of every individual to the possession and control of his own person, free from all restraint or interference of others, unless by clear and unquestionable authority of law.' " *Cruzan*, 497 U.S. at 269 (quoting *Union Pac.*, 141 U.S. 250, 251 (1891)). "[O]ur notions of liberty are inextricably entwined with our idea of physical freedom and self-determination." *Id.* at 287 (O'Connor, J., concurring). " 'Liberty,' if it means anything, must entail freedom from governmental domination in making the most intimate and personal of decisions." *Rust v. Sullivan*, 500 U.S. 173, 216 (1991) (quoting *Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 416, 444 (1983); *Maher v. Roe*, 432 U.S. 464, 473 (1977)).

The Supreme Court has recognized that a person has the right to consent to and refuse medical treatment, which

is a liberty interest right of self-determination. *See Cruzan v. Missouri Department of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 278 (1990); *Washington v. Harper*, 494 U.S. 210, 221-222 (1990). *See also Canterbury v. Spence*, 464 F.2d 772, 780 (D.C. Cir. 1972), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1064 (1972) ("[t]he root premise is the concept, fundamental in American jurisprudence, that '[e]very human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his own body. . . .' " (quotation omitted)). In *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), the Supreme Court affirmed the principle that a person has the right, grounded in the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause, to control fundamental decisions involving his or her own body. The right to personal autonomy was reaffirmed in *Akron*, 462 U.S. 416, 419-20 (1983). *See also Winston v. Lee*, 470 U.S. 753, 762 (1985); *Schmerber v. California*, 384 U.S. 757, 772 (1966) ("[t]he integrity of an individual's person is a cherished value of our society").

B. The Right of Self-Determination Protects a Wisconsin Doctor, as Well as Patients, From Being Compelled to Do Something Against His or Her Will.

A doctor, just like his or her patient, has a right to self-determination. The doctor has a constitutionally protected liberty interest in his or her own bodily integrity. The Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision in *Schreiber* violates that right of self-determination. The decision compels doctors to physically perform, or provide, whatever procedure or treatment is demanded by the patient. A doctor may decide not to perform a specific procedure for many reasons. It may be medically inadvisable. The procedure may subject the doctor to malpractice. The procedure may be against the doctor's religious beliefs. The supreme court's decision, however, takes away Wisconsin doctors' right to decide whether or not to perform a procedure.

II. INFORMED CONSENT LAW SHOULD NOT COMPEL A DOCTOR TO PERFORM A PROCEDURE THAT IS NOT MEDICALLY APPROPRIATE.

Here, Dr. Figge believed that the medically appropriate treatment, given the treatment selected by Mrs. Schreiber (i.e. the VBAC), was to continue with the VBAC. There was no indication for a cesarean, other than the patient's pain. At trial, the expert witnesses agreed that a certain percentage of patients request cesareans to end the pain of labor. Dr. Cruikshank, a board certified obstetrician and gynecologist, with a subspecialty of high risk obstetrics, who was called by the defense, testified that such requests are "very frequent." Dr. Meier, also board certified in obstetrics and gynecology, as well as maternal-fetal medicine and high risk obstetrics, who was also called by the defense, testified that patients ask for cesareans "with great regularity." (R. 100 at 45, 173-4). Dr. Cruikshank testified that some women in labor desire sterilization, but that once the labor is completed, they would regret such a choice. Dr. Klavan, plaintiffs' expert, testified that he would never perform a cesarean unless it was medically indicated, despite the patient's wishes. (R. 91 at 100). Dr. Klavan also agreed that he would disregard a mid-labor request for sterilization for the same reason. (R. 91 at 110-11). Plaintiffs' other expert, Dr. Giles, was the only expert who testified that he would perform a cesarean based solely on the patient's request, but even he admitted that he would recommend continuation of labor if a cesarean was not medically indicated. (R.98 at 168-169).

A. Dr. Figge Risked Committing Medical Malpractice By Proceeding With Mrs. Schreiber's Demands.

Here, Dr. Figge fulfilled the informed consent law before Mrs. Schreiber went into labor. Mrs. Schreiber, knowing all of the risks, benefits and viable options (including a cesarean) chose to proceed with a vaginal delivery. When Mrs. Schreiber went into labor, Dr. Figge proceeded with the course chosen by Mrs. Schreiber and he treated Mrs. Schreiber as he would any other patient who had chosen a vaginal delivery. During Mrs. Schreiber's labor, Dr. Figge made the clinical judgment that a cesarean was not appropriate for pain only. (The surgery was not indicated under the circumstances). Had Dr. Figge been forced to perform the demanded procedure, the cesarean, and something had occurred during the cesarean, Dr. Figge could have been found guilty of medical malpractice. There clearly were risks associated with the cesarean, which had been discussed with Mrs. Schreiber before her labor began. For example, if Mrs. Schreiber died during the cesarean, because of some anesthesia accident, Dr. Figge would have been criticized for proceeding with the cesarean simply because the patient had demanded it for pain relief, when there were no other symptoms requiring the procedure.

If Mrs. Schreiber had demanded sterilization during her labor, so that she would not have to endure the pain again, under the supreme court's decision, Dr. Figge would have been compelled to perform a tubal ligation or hysterectomy to satisfy the informed consent law. Sterilization was certainly always a viable medical option. However, after the delivery, Dr. Figge could have been subjected to malpractice for performing the procedure as a way of relieving pain in the future.

B. Dr. Figge Will Not Be the Only Wisconsin Doctor Who Loses His Right to Self-Determination.

Dr. Figge will not be the only Wisconsin doctor affected by the Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision. Other doctors will be forced to perform surgeries that they do not agree with, thereby violating their rights to self-determination.

Many potential examples of when the supreme court decision will compel action, against a doctor's will, can be envisioned. For example, a man arrives at the emergency room with a severe cut on his finger. The emergency doctor advises the man that there are several viable options for treatment, including surgical repair and amputation. The doctor strongly recommends the surgical repair. The patient agrees to proceed as recommended. During the repair, however, the pain is so intense, that the patient demands amputation. The doctor does not believe that amputation is the medically appropriate course of treatment and knows that the man is only requesting amputation because of the pain. Under the supreme court's decision, the doctor would be forced to conduct a second informed consent discussion, in the middle of the surgical procedure, and then perform the amputation as demanded by the patient. (This course would likely subject the doctor to a malpractice claim for performing the amputation, when it was not medically indicated, although it was a viable medical option).

C. The Supreme Court Decision Compels the Doctor to Perform Whatever Procedure is Demanded, as Long as It is a Viable Medical Option.

The supreme court decision fails to appreciate that there is a difference between a viable medical option and an option

that is indicated. A viable option may include modes of treatment generally considered by the medical profession to be within the scope of current, acceptable standards of care. *See* Wisconsin Administrative Code, sec. Med. 18.02(3). With respect to treatment options, a viable method within the standard of care encompasses every method of treatment which does not fall to the level of unreasonable negligent conduct. *Nowatske v. Osterloh*, 198 Wis. 2d 419, 438, 543 N.W.2d 265 (1996). An "indicated" medical option refers to "a particular remedy or treatment as suitable or necessary." Random House Unabridged Dictionary 972 (2d ed. 1993). Many alternative methods of treatment may be within the accepted standard of care, but not suitable, necessary or recommended for an individual patient.

Consider a patient with a coronary artery blockage. Treatment within the current standard of care would include bypass surgery, angioplasty (insertion of a balloon-type device in the blocked vessel) or thrombolytic (clot bursting) medications. Since all are alternative, viable modes of treatment within the standard of care [*see*, Med. 18.02(3)], a physician has a duty to explain these as alternatives. For one patient, all three therapies may be indicated, and the patient can make an informed election after considering the risks and benefits of each. However, for another patient, only surgery may be indicated. Should the patient have a right to demand thrombolytic therapy because it is within the standard of care, although not indicated?

A physician following the *Schreiber* rationale may believe he then has a legal obligation to acquiesce to the patient's request and administer thrombolytics. As a consequence of this therapy, the patient could experience intracranial bleeding and brain damage which is a known

risk of treatment. Had the physician's judgment been the controlling force and therapy limited to what was indicated, the patient would not have been subjected to this risk. Rhetorically speaking, if such a scenario unfolds, can the physician then use *Schreiber* as a defense to a subsequent malpractice action? This scenario could play out every single day at every emergency department in this state.

Another everyday example might involve the development of a breast lump. Biopsy, mammogram and observation are methods of approaching this frequent occurrence. A physician may feel that a mammogram is appropriate and, based on the result, observation. The patient, quite understandably, may request a breast biopsy for "peace of mind." A well-trained physician acting within the highest standards may come to the judgment that a biopsy is not indicated. Nevertheless, at the patient's request, a surgical biopsy, which is contraindicated, is then performed. A minor complication, such a wound infection, or a major complication, such as an anesthesia accident, may result. Again, by complying with *Schreiber*, a physician could become subject to liability in a standard medical malpractice action for performing a surgical biopsy that was contraindicated.

There are undoubtedly more everyday examples which could be entertained. The cautionary language of the supreme court's decision cannot preclude situations such as these from actually occurring.

In this case, Dr. Figge did not believe that a cesarean was indicated until shortly before the emergency cesarean was performed. Dr. Figge concluded that the procedure was indicated when the baby's heart rate decreased. If Dr. Figge

had been wrong in his medical judgment, he could be held accountable through a claim of medical negligence. Under the circumstances presented, and all of the symptoms demonstrated, was it within the standard of care for Dr. Figge to continue with the VBAC, and not perform a cesarean. This is not an informed consent issue.

D. Withdrawal as the Physician Is Not A Possibility For Avoiding the Problem.

In the majority of cases, Wisconsin doctors will not have the option of withdrawing as the patient's doctor, in order to preserve their right to self-determination and to avoid performing the demanded surgery. Dr. Figge, when faced with Mrs. Schreiber's request for a cesarean, could not have simply walked away. He was in the middle of the treatment that had been selected by Mrs. Schreiber.

A patient has the right to know about and even select medical procedures that are available but not recommended by his or her doctor. However, the patient's right does not require a given doctor to perform a specific treatment. "The doctor should retain the right to refuse to follow a course of treatment that contravenes the doctor's opinion as to proper medical practice and procedure." *Schreiber*, 217 Wis. 2d at 114 (Myse, J., dissenting); App. B at 42a. Wisconsin doctors should maintain their right to self-determination, which would include making the decision as to whether or not to perform a procedure demanded by a patient.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, the Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant its Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY J. STRATTNER
Counsel of Record
PAUL J. KELLY
LINDA V. MEAGHER
SCHELLINGER & DOYLE, S.C.
Attorneys for Petitioner
Wisconsin Patients
Compensation Fund
445 South Moorland Road
Suite 450
P.O. Box 464
Brookfield, WI 53008
(414) 785-0200

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN DATED AND DECIDED JANUARY 26, 1999

Kimberly SCHREIBER, a minor by her Guardian ad Litem, John Krueger; Gerald Schreiber and Janice Schreiber, Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN; Paul K.H. Figge, Jr., M.D.; Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund, Defendants-Respondents-Petitioners,

STATE of Wisconsin and Employers Health Insurance Company, Defendants.

Supreme Court

No. 96-3676. Oral argument October 7, 1998. — Decided January 26, 1999.

(Affirming 217 Wis. 2d 94, 579 N.W.2d 730 (Ct. App. 1998).)

(Also reported in 588 N.W.2d 26.)

* * *

¶ 1. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J. The defendants, Physicians Insurance Company of Wisconsin (Physicians Insurance), Dr. Paul K.H. Figge, Jr., and Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund, seek review of a published decision

of the court of appeals that reversed the circuit court's dismissal of a suit brought by the plaintiffs Kimberly Schreiber and her parents, Janice and Gerald Schreiber.[1] They allege that Figge violated Janice's right to informed consent by failing to again conduct an informed consent discussion after Janice withdrew her consent to a vaginal delivery while in labor.[2] Because we determine that during her labor Janice withdrew her consent to a vaginal delivery and that at the time of her withdrawal there existed medically viable options for treatment, we conclude that her withdrawal constitutes a substantial change in circumstances requiring a new informed consent discussion. Additionally, we determine that a subjective test should be applied to the question of whether Figge's failure to conduct another informed consent discussion was a cause of the Schreibers' injuries. Accordingly, we affirm the court of appeals.

¶ 2. The relevant facts are essentially undisputed. This action stems from Janice Schreiber's labor and delivery of Kimberly Schreiber at Saint Mary's Hospital in Rhinelander, Wisconsin. This was Janice's third pregnancy. Figge served as Janice's obstetrician in all three of her pregnancies and delivered all three of her children. Her first two children were delivered by way of cesarean sections.

---

1. *Schreiber v. Physicians Ins. Co.*, 217 Wis. 2d 94, 579 N.W.2d 730 (Ct. App. 1998) (reversing judgment of Circuit Court for Oneida County, James W. Karch, Reserve Judge).

2. Informed consent is codified at Wis. Stat. § 448.30 (1995-96). Unless otherwise noted, all further references to the Wisconsin Statutes will be to the 1995-96 version.

Appendix A

Figge performed the first cesarean delivery in 1981 because after over 17 hours of labor Janice still had not progressed to a point where a vaginal delivery was possible. At the time of Janice's second delivery in 1984, the prevailing medical practice followed the "once a cesarean always a cesarean" rule. As a result, Janice had her second child by cesarean delivery.

¶ 3. By the time of her pregnancy with Kimberly in 1987, the prevailing medical research and practice suggested that having a vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC) was no more dangerous than having another cesarean delivery. In some circumstances a VBAC presented less risk to the health of both the mother and child than did another cesarean delivery. In the course of Janice's prenatal care she and Figge discussed a VBAC delivery as an alternative to another cesarean delivery. Figge recommended attempting the VBAC and Janice agreed to that course of treatment. Janice testified at trial that she was under the impression that she would first attempt the VBAC but could change her mind during labor and instead have another cesarean delivery. Figge testified that he understood Janice's pre-labor choice of the VBAC to be decisive, meaning that once her labor began Kimberly would be delivered vaginally unless and until Janice's symptoms medically warranted a cesarean section.

¶ 4. As her delivery neared, Janice went into labor and was admitted into the hospital at approximately 4:00 a.m. Janice signed consent forms for both a VBAC and cesarean delivery as part of her hospital admission. Figge first visited Janice's hospital room at 8:00 a.m. to see how her labor

was progressing. At that 8:00 a.m. visit Janice told Figge that she had changed her mind and wanted to abandon her plan for a VBAC and instead have another cesarean delivery. Figge urged Janice to continue with the VBAC. At approximately 8:30 a.m., Figge concluded that Janice's labor was not progressing as he had hoped. He then manually broke Janice's amniotic fluid sac in an effort to speed up the labor. Janice thereafter began experiencing excruciating abdominal pains sharply different from her contractions and unlike anything she had experienced with her prior deliveries. Nurses attempted unsuccessfully to ease the pain with various medicines. The pain was so unbearable that at one point Janice sent her husband to locate their nurse so that the nurse would again relay to Figge Janice's desire for a cesarean delivery.

¶ 5. Figge next checked on Janice at approximately 1:00 p.m. Again Janice complained of the abdominal pain. Figge attempted to diagnose the source of the pain but could not determine conclusively that it was caused by either a uterine rupture or separation of the placenta from the wall of the uterus. Figge concluded that the abdominal pains did not pose a danger to either Janice or Kimberly. He based this diagnosis primarily on his experience of seeing other women in labor suffer from similar abdominal pains that disappeared after delivery.

¶ 6. Also at this 1:00 p.m. visit Janice again informed Figge that she wished to cease the VBAC and instead have another cesarean delivery. Figge again instructed Janice to remain patient because he wanted to give the VBAC more time. When Janice protested, again complained of the pain,

and again requested a cesarean delivery, Figge tersely responded to the effect that if he performed a cesarean delivery on every woman who wanted one that all deliveries would be by cesarean section.

¶ 7. Janice later testified at trial that she was upset and intimidated by Figge's comment. As a result, she did not again bring the issue of ceasing the VBAC to Figge's attention. Figge later testified that he sensed no barrier between Janice and himself from that conversation. He further testified that at the 1:00 p.m. visit he knew that Janice would have preferred to have a cesarean delivery but that he thought the better course of treatment was to continue with the VBAC. Figge also testified that he would have acquiesced if Janice had further persisted in her requests for a cesarean delivery.

¶ 8. Janice's labor still did not progress as Figge would have liked. At 2:00 p.m. Figge again visited Janice's room to check on her condition. Figge again counseled Janice against the cesarean delivery and continued to advocate for continuing with the VBAC. After Figge's earlier terse statement, Janice did not reiterate her desire for a cesarean section. Figge interpreted her silence as her concurrence in continuing with the VBAC.

¶ 9. At 3:40 p.m. Kimberly's heart rate dropped. Figge was summoned and performed an emergency cesarean section at just after 4:00 p.m. It was too late. Janice's uterus had ruptured depriving Kimberly of oxygen. Kimberly was born a spastic quadriplegic and she cannot move below her neck or speak. The parties have stipulated that had Kimberly

been delivered prior to 3:29 p.m. she would have been born a healthy child.

¶ 10. The Schreibers sued Figge and his insurer, alleging both that Figge was negligent in his misdiagnosis of Janice's abdominal pain and that he violated Janice's informed consent rights. At some point in the litigation the Schreibers dropped their medical malpractice claim and proceeded to trial solely on the informed consent cause of action.

¶ 11. After a trial to the court, the circuit court found that Janice made an informed consent to the VBAC prior to the beginning of her labor. The circuit court also found that by the 8:00 a.m. meeting, Janice would have opted to discontinue the VBAC and instead have another cesarean delivery if Figge had offered her the choice. Although she repeatedly communicated this preference to Figge, he did not comply with her request. He knew the cesarean delivery was a viable medical option but did not consider it to be medically indicated. The circuit court held that Figge's duty was to manage Janice's labor in a way that would safely achieve the goal of delivery by VBAC upon the onset of labor.

¶ 12. The circuit court further concluded that Figge was under no obligation to re-advise Janice of her medical options or seek new consent when her labor did not progress as planned. The court reasoned that a doctor would only need to re-obtain consent when there was a substantial medical change in circumstances so that the patient faced risks unconsidered when the original consent was given.

The court determined that the risks Janice faced when her labor did not progress were no different than the risks she was made aware of when she originally gave her consent. The circuit court concluded that there was no substantial change in circumstances and dismissed the Schreibers' case.

¶ 13. The Schreibers appealed and contended that Janice's statements to Figge that she no longer wanted to continue with the VBAC were a withdrawal of her consent which triggered Figge's duty to have a new informed consent discussion. A divided court of appeals reversed the circuit court and concluded that where two or more medically acceptable options for treatment are present, the "competent patient has the absolute right to select from among [those] treatment options after being informed of the relative risks and benefits of each approach." *Schreiber v. Physicians Ins. Co.*, 217 Wis. 2d 94, 103, 579 N.W.2d 730 (Ct. App. 1998). It grounded its holding both in the informed consent statute and the common law right of bodily integrity from which the statute is derived. *Id.* at 103-04. The court of appeals determined that in order for the doctrine of informed consent to be effective, it must require a physician to do more than outline the methods of treatment available to a patient. Informed consent must also bind the physician to follow the course of treatment chosen by the patient so long as that chosen treatment is medically viable. *Id.* at 105.

¶ 14. The court of appeals reasoned that both the VBAC and cesarean delivery were viable medical options from the beginning of labor. Janice at first chose the VBAC. Some time into her labor she changed her mind and chose a

cesarean delivery. Thus, the court of appeals concluded that Figge violated Janice's informed consent right by refusing to follow her clearly communicated choice of treatment during labor. *Id.* at 107. Figge and Physicians Insurance petitioned this court for review.

¶ 15. Before delving into our analysis we first sound a cautionary note. This opinion does not address controversial issues at each end of the medical spectrum. Namely, this opinion should not be interpreted as creating a patient's right to demand any treatment she desires. Further, this opinion should not be interpreted as requiring physicians to perform procedures they do not consider medically viable, procedures for which they lack the appropriate expertise, or procedures to which they are morally opposed. Rather, this case is decided on narrow and discrete issues: (1) Did Janice withdraw her consent; (2) if so, did that withdrawal together with the existence of viable medical options for treatment trigger Figge's duty under the informed consent statute to again discuss the benefits and risks of her medical options; and (3) if such a duty exists, should an objective or subjective test be applied to the question of whether Figge's failure to conduct another informed consent discussion caused the Schreibers' injuries?

¶ 16. The issues present a mixed question of fact and law. We defer to the circuit court's findings of fact unless they are unsupported by the record and are therefore clearly erroneous. *Clarmar Realty Co., Inc. v. City of Milwaukee Redevelopment Authority*, 129 Wis. 2d 81, 94, 383 N.W.2d 890 (1986); Wis. Stat. § 805.17(2). However, the application of those facts to the pertinent law is a question of law which

we review independently of the determinations rendered by the court of appeals and circuit court but benefiting from their analyses. *Miller v. Thomack*, 210 Wis. 2d 650, 658, 563 N.W.2d 891 (1997).

¶ 17. The doctrine of informed consent traces its origins to the common law notion that an adult has a "right to determine what shall be done with his own body. . . ." *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital*, 105 N.E. 92, 93 (N.Y. 1914), *overruled on other grounds*, *Bing v. Thunig*, 143 N.E.2d 3 (N.Y. 1957). Originally founded on the common law tort of assault and battery, *see Paulsen v. Gundersen*, 218 Wis. 578, 584, 260 N.W. 448 (1935), the limitations of that theoretical framework became apparent with the passage of time. *Trogun v. Fruchtman*, 58 Wis. 2d 569, 598-99, 207 N.W.2d 297 (1973). Namely, a doctor's performance of an unauthorized treatment did not intuitively coincide with the "intentional, antisocial nature of battery" nor did it adequately reflect the fact that patients "consent" on some level whenever they see a doctor. *Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 171, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995). As a result, negligence — the doctor's failure to exercise reasonable care to a patient — replaced intentional battery as the theoretical underpinning for the doctrine. *Id.*

¶ 18. Over twenty years ago this court gave shape to the doctrine as it currently exists in Wisconsin. *Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975). In light of the fundamental purpose driving the doctrine, we concluded that a physician's duty to reveal the risks and benefits of available treatment options extended to the information a reasonable patient would need

to know in order to make an informed decision. *Id.* at 12-13. We stressed that physicians were not required to disclose absolutely every fact or remote possibility that could theoretically accompany a procedure. Rather, the touchstone of the test was what the reasonable person in the position of the patient would want to know. *Id.* at 13.

¶ 19. Within a few years after we decided *Scaria*, the legislature codified *Scaria*'s test as Wis. Stat. § 448.30.[3]

---

3. **448.30 Information on alternate modes of treatment.** Any physician who treats a patient shall inform the patient about the availability of all alternate, viable medical modes of treatment and about the benefits and risks of these treatments. The physician's duty to inform the patient under this section does not require disclosure of:

> (1) Information beyond what a reasonably well-qualified physician in a similar medical classification would know.
>
> (2) Detailed technical information that in all probability a patient would not understand.
>
> (3) Risks apparent or known to the patient.
>
> (4) Extremely remote possibilities that might falsely or detrimentally alarm the patient.
>
> (5) Information in emergencies where failure to provide treatment would be more harmful to the patient than treatment.
>
> (6) Information in cases where the patient is incapable of consenting.

Appendix A

The statute requires physicians to disclose information to patients about the viable medical modes of treatment so that when the patient chooses a method of treatment, that choice is made knowing both the reasonable risks and benefits of her decision.

¶ 20. There is no question on appeal that prior to Janice's labor, Figge satisfied the requirements of the informed consent statute. That issue was contested at trial and was resolved in favor of Figge. The Schreibers do not challenge that finding on appeal. Were that the whole of the story, this case would not have come before this court. The Schreibers argue that after Janice's initial consent but before Kimberly's birth a substantial change of circumstances occurred that nullified the original consent and obligated Figge to again have an informed consent discussion with Janice. That substantial change of circumstances was Janice's withdrawal of her consent where another medically viable option existed.

¶ 21. There is little doubt that consent, once given, is not categorically immutable. *See Mack v. Mack*, 618 A.2d 744 (Md. 1993) ("a corollary to [informed consent] is the patient's right, in general, to refuse treatment and to withdraw consent to treatment once begun"). If we determine as a matter of fact that consent was withdrawn, we must also determine as a matter of law whether consent can be withdrawn at this particular stage of the procedure.

¶ 22. The circuit court concluded that Janice initially agreed to the VBAC and that once labor began she could not change her decision unless there was a substantial

change in medical circumstances. It is undisputed that during her labor Janice told Figge on three separate occasions that she wanted to cease the VBAC and have a cesarean delivery. Moreover, Janice sent her husband to tell the nurse to relay the message to Figge yet another time. Though she never said the magic words, "I revoke" we conclude that her repeated statements are clear indication of her withdrawal of consent. The circuit court thought likewise, concluding that if Figge had put the "choice to her squarely," she would have chosen the cesarean. Even Figge recognized that Janice no longer desired to continue with the VBAC. He testified that he would have done the cesarean section had Janice persisted.[4] We are unsure, after three unsuccessful personal attempts and a fourth unsuccessful attempt through the nurse, how much more Janice could have done to convince Figge.

---

4. Figge's testimony on cross-examination was as follows:

> Q. [A]s a hypothetical matter, if after [Figge discussed the matter with Janice,] Mrs. Schreiber had refused your recommendation, your recommendation being [to continue the VBAC], if there would have been a refusal to accept what you were recommending to the patient, Doctor, and a demand made at that point for repeat cesarean, what would you have done?
>
> A. Well, like I said, I would still have tried to encourage her to proceed, but, you know, if I wasn't able to convince her so that she would be comfortable proceeding and persisted, I think I would have to — probably have to go along with that request, but I have never had that situation.

¶ 23. Regardless of whether she factually withdrew her consent, the circuit court concluded that once a procedure has been initiated the time for a decision and discussions relating to that decision has passed. We reject the notion that the onset of a procedure categorically forecloses a patient's withdrawal of consent. To be sure, at some point in virtually every medical procedure a patient reaches a point from which there is no return. However, that point need not be arbitrarily created at the commencement of treatment. Rather it varies with the nature and circumstances of the individual procedure and continues so long as there exist alternative viable modes of medical treatment.

¶ 24. In this case, a cesarean delivery at all times remained a viable medical alternative to the VBAC and ultimately that is how Figge delivered Kimberly. Unlike the circuit court, we determine that since alternative viable modes of medical treatment existed, Janice was still able to withdraw her consent to the VBAC.

¶ 25. Having determined that Janice had withdrawn her consent to the VBAC, we must now examine the effect, if any, of that withdrawal. The Schreibers contend that her withdrawal both removed Figge's authority to continue with the VBAC and obligated him to conduct another informed consent discussion. We agree.

¶ 26. In considering Figge's authority to continue with the VBAC, we note well-settled law provides that a physician, absent exigent circumstances, may not perform a procedure on a competent adult without consent. *See, e.g., Lojuk v. Quandt*, 706 F.2d 1456, 1460 (7th Cir. 1983)

(applying Illinois law); *see also In the Matter of Guardianship of L.W.*, 167 Wis. 2d 53, 68, 482 N.W.2d 60 (1992) ("The logical corollary of the doctrine of informed consent is the right not to consent — the right to refuse treatment."); *Paulsen*, 218 Wis. at 583-84. Figge would not assert that absent Janice's consent to the VBAC he would nonetheless be authorized to attempt the procedure. The function of withdrawal, in effect, places Janice and Figge in their original position — a physician, a patient, and a series of options for treatment. It creates a blank slate on which the parties must again diagram their plan.

¶ 27. Since Figge no longer had consent to continue with the VBAC we are persuaded that Janice's withdrawal obligated Figge under the statute to again have an informed consent discussion with her. The circuit court reasoned that the physician's duty to again conduct an informed consent discussion occurred only if the medical circumstances were so changed as to alter the risks a patient faced from the time he or she first consented. Though not cited by the circuit court, this is essentially the position taken by the Colorado Supreme Court in *Gorab v. Zook*, 943 P.2d 423, 430-31 (Colo. 1997).

¶ 28. In *Gorab*, the Colorado Supreme Court concluded that, under Colorado law, a physician has no general duty to continue to explain the treatment options and their corresponding risks once the physician obtains consent and begins the procedure. *Id.* at 430. However, the Colorado court noted that "where a new, previously undisclosed, and substantial risk arises, there may be an additional and independent duty to warn" the patient of that risk. *Id.* The

Gorab court, much like the circuit court in this case, concluded that because any risks the patient faced during the procedure were risks previously disclosed, the physician was not under a duty to conduct another informed consent discussion.

¶ 29. As a general principle, we find *Gorab*'s and the circuit court's rationale convincing. If a patient consents to a procedure knowing the risks, the physician has satisfied his or her duty under the informed consent statute. We conclude, however, the circuit court erred in its determination of what could constitute a substantial change of circumstances. The circuit court only considered medical changes of circumstances. We conclude that it needed to consider legal changes of circumstances as well. A withdrawal of consent during the course of treatment to the treatment agreed upon before treatment constitutes a substantial change in circumstances triggering a physician's duty under the informed consent statute to re-advise the patient of the available treatment options and their risks.

¶ 30. Either a substantial medical or substantial legal change of circumstances results in an alteration of the universe of options a patient has and alters the agreed upon course of navigation through that universe. Where the change is medical, the alteration is a new risk or benefit previously unforeseen. Where the change is legal, the alteration is a withdrawal of an option previously foreseen. Though these cases travel from different directions, they arrive at the same destination: a new informed consent discussion. This discussion, much like any other such discussion, would have entailed the risks and benefits at

that time of the medically viable modes of treatment and again presented her an opportunity to choose her treatment.

¶ 31. This conclusion does not alter the principles of informed consent. Rather it more fully articulates those principles by applying the doctrine in a factual context we have previously not faced. Our cases to date have only dealt with the initial adequacy of the informed consent discussion. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Kokemoor*, 199 Wis. 2d 615, 545 N.W.2d 495 (1996) (informed consent discussion before the procedure did not adequately inform the patient of morbidity rates and the physician's lack of experience in performing the procedure); *Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 167-69 (the informed consent discussion did not reveal the availability of a CT scanner and the unavailability of a neurosurgeon at the particular hospital); *Scaria*, 68 Wis. 2d at 3-9 (the informed consent discussion failed to inform patient that dye used for x-rays could cause paralysis or death); *Trogun*, 58 Wis. 2d at 592-604 (the informed consent discussion failed to explain potential side effects of drug for tuberculosis).

¶ 32. This case, however, asks us to determine the continuing vitality of an informed consent discussion. We decline to view the informed consent discussion as a solitary and blanketing event, a point on a timeline after which such discussions are no longer needed because they are "covered" by some articulable occurrence in the past. Rather, a substantial change in circumstances, be it medical or legal, requires a new informed consent discussion. *See, e.g., Paulsen*, 218 Wis. at 583-84 (consent for "simple" mastoid operation not sufficient for "radical" version of the same

operation). To conclude otherwise would allow a solitary informed consent discussion to immunize a physician for any and all subsequent treatment of that patient.

¶ 33. Consistent with Wis. Stat. § 448.30 Figge had a duty to conduct another informed consent discussion and should have again presented Janice her treatment options and given her the opportunity to choose. His failure to do so was a violation of that duty.

¶ 34. As with any negligence action, a party must show the breach of a duty that caused an injury. Having determined that Figge breached his duty under the informed consent statute, we now turn to whether the circuit court erred in applying an objective test to the question of whether Figge's failure to again conduct an informed consent discussion was a cause of the Schreibers' injuries. *See Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 182.

¶ 35. Since at least *Scaria*, this court has agreed with the majority of American jurisdictions in employing what is known as the "objective test." *Scaria*, 68 Wis. 2d at 12-15. The objective test focuses on what the attitudes and actions of the reasonable person in the position of the patient would have been rather than on what the attitudes and actions of the particular patient of the litigation actually were. It asks two questions. First, did the physician fail to give information that a reasonable patient would want to know? *Kokemoor*, 199 Wis. 2d at 632. Second, given the additional information, would the reasonable patient have acted differently than they did without the information? *Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 182.

¶ 36. We adopted this objective test because it is more amenable to the adverse nature of litigation. Litigation rarely occurs in the absence of injury. With this in mind, we have concluded that the objective test is more "workable and more fair" than asking the fact finder to determine the question of liability in large part on the credibility of a plaintiff whose testimony is tempered by the occasion of an undesirable event. *Scaria*, 68 Wis. 2d at 15; *Canterbury v. Spence*, 464 F.2d 772, 791 (D.C. Cir. 1972) ("[The subjective test] calls for a subjective determination solely on testimony of a patient-witness shadowed by the occurrence of the undisclosed risk.").

¶ 37. We reaffirm our commitment to the objective test when faced with a traditional informed consent case. The rationale for the objective test set forth in *Scaria* has worn well in the decades that have passed since its announcement and remains a durable fabric for the future. In traditional informed consent cases, an injured patient alleges that the physician failed to reveal some pertinent information, and that the patient would not have consented to the course of treatment if the pertinent information was disclosed. *See, e.g.*, *Kokemoor*, 199 Wis. 2d at 641-47 (physician failed to adequately explain morbidity rates and the physician's lack of experience performing the particular procedure); *Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 167-69 (the informed consent discussion did not reveal the availability of a CT scanner and the unavailability of a neurosurgeon at the particular hospital); *Scaria*, 68 Wis. 2d at 3-9 (physician failed to inform patient that dye used for x-rays could cause paralysis or death). Thus, our law has framed the cause question essentially as, "Would a reasonable patient have acted differently if the

informed consent discussion had occurred?" *See Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 182.

¶ 38. However, in this type of case the underlying rationale for the objective test, as noted above, is not implicated. The traditional informed consent case necessarily requires a fact finder to do more than find facts; it requires the fact finder to be prophetic. The fact finder is not only asked to determine what actually did happen but is also asked to determine what would have happened if the informed consent discussion had occurred. The fact finder is asked to construct a puzzle with pieces missing and, where missing, to create them so that the puzzle is complete.

¶ 39. Yet, in this case, the fact finder is asked only to determine what did occur and to put the existing pieces of the puzzle together. Janice does not contend that she did not have adequate information about her delivery options so that, if she had more information, she would have chosen the cesarean delivery. Her claim is based on Figge's failure to conduct an informed consent discussion which deprived her of the opportunity for her choice of treatment after she clearly expressed her withdrawal of consent for the VBAC.

¶ 40. In this type of informed consent case where the issue is not whether she was given the pertinent information so that her choice was informed, but rather whether she was given an opportunity to make a choice after having all of the pertinent information, the cause question is transformed into, "What did the patient himself or herself want?" In these cases, the objective test is not needed and may lead to absurd results. It is not needed because the danger it alleviates —

relying on an injured plaintiff's testimony to determine what would have occurred — does not exist because the fact finder is not asked to determine what would have occurred but only what did occur. It can lead to absurd results when the known and concrete choice of the actual person may well be ignored if it does not comport to what the hypothetical reasonable person would have chosen.

¶ 41. Having determined above that Janice did withdraw her consent and that her withdrawal triggered Figge's duty to have another informed consent discussion, by applying the subjective test we further conclude that had Janice been given the opportunity for a choice in treatment she would have chosen the cesarean delivery. Our conclusion is based not on speculation but on the record and factual findings of the circuit court. There can be no serious disagreement that Janice stated that she wanted the cesarean delivery. Figge's testimony indicates that he knew Janice wanted the cesarean delivery. Further, the circuit court found that she already had all of the necessary information and that "if the choice had been put to her squarely she would have opted for a [cesarean] section." Applying the objective test to a case such as this would result in the evisceration of Janice's actually expressed and understood choice of treatment in favor of what the hypothetical reasonable person would have chosen. When we actually know what was chosen based on the disclosure of all of the pertinent information, we need not engage in the hypothetical exercise of what the reasonable person would have chosen.

¶ 42. In summary, we determine that Janice withdrew her consent to a vaginal delivery. Because alternative viable

modes of medical treatment existed at that time, her withdrawal constituted a substantial change in circumstances obligating Figge under Wis. Stat. § 448.30 to conduct a new informed consent discussion and affording Janice the opportunity for a choice of treatment. Figge's failure to conduct such a discussion deprived Janice of the opportunity to proceed with her actual and clearly expressed choice, a cesarean delivery. In applying the subjective test to causation, we conclude that the plaintiffs' damages flowed from Figge's failure to conduct the informed consent discussion. Accordingly, we affirm the court of appeals.

By the Court. — The decision of the court of appeals is affirmed and the cause remanded to the circuit court to determine damages.

APPENDIX B — OPINION OF THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS DATED AND DECIDED FEBRUARY 17, 1998

Kimberly SCHREIBER, a minor by her Guardian ad Litem, John Krueger; Gerald Schreiber and Janice Schreiber, Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN; Paul K.H. Figge, Jr., M.D.; Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund, Defendants-Respondents,†

STATE of Wisconsin and Employers Health Insurance Company, Defendants.

Court of Appeals

No. 96-3676. Oral argument October 16,1997. — Decided February 17, 1998.

(Also reported in 579 N.W.2d 730.)

* * *

Before Cane, P.J., Myse and Hoover, JJ.

CANE, P. J. Kimberly Schreiber and her parents, Janice and Gerald Schreiber, appeal from a judgment dismissing their claim that Dr. Paul K. H. Figge, Jr., violated Janice's right to informed consent. The Schreibers contend the trial

---

† Petition to review granted.

court erred by concluding that Janice was not entitled to choose a cesarean section in the midst of childbirth, and by holding that Figge had no duty to either inform Janice of changes that occurred during labor or to obtain her consent to vaginal delivery after those changes occurred. We conclude that under the specific facts of this case Figge violated his duty under the informed consent statute by refusing to comply with Janice's request for a cesarean. We therefore reverse the judgment and remand the matter to the trial court for a determination of damages.

It is helpful to state at the outset what this case is and is not about. This is not a case establishing a right to treatment on demand. This is also not a case in which the doctor is ethically opposed to a requested treatment, nor is it a case in which the requested treatment falls outside the doctor's practice and experience. Rather, this case involves a doctor who ignores a patient's choice between two medically viable treatment options.

The trial court's findings of fact are substantially undisputed.[1] Prior to the labor that lies at the heart of this case, Janice had two children by cesarean. The first cesarean was performed because of insufficient progress seventeen hours after Janice went into labor. The second cesarean was performed because it was then standard medical procedure to do elective repeat cesarean births. Figge performed both of these procedures.

When Janice became pregnant with Kimberly it was becoming more medically acceptable to attempt a vaginal

---

1. This case was tried to the court without a jury.

birth after cesarean (VBAC). Janice met with Figge to discuss the alternatives and, after being given a choice between a cesarean and a VBAC, elected the VBAC. Figge testified at trial that he told Janice that her vaginal delivery would be treated like any other labor, and that a cesarean would be performed if medically indicated.

Janice began labor and was admitted to the hospital shortly after 4 a.m. Figge first saw her at about 8 a.m., and at that time Janice told him that she had changed her mind and wanted a cesarean. Figge did not grant her request. At about 8:30 a.m., Figge concluded that Janice's VBAC delivery was not progressing as fast as he would like and he therefore performed an amniotomy, the breaking of the mother's amniotic fluid sac. Janice thereafter began to experience severe upper abdominal pain unlike any she had felt in her prior deliveries, and that she did not associate with her contractions. She was given pain medication throughout the remainder of her labor with limited success.

At 1 p.m. Figge returned to Janice's room to examine her. He concluded that she was making insufficient progress in labor, and tried but failed to discern the cause of her pain. Although Figge felt he could not completely rule out two potentially harmful causes of the pain, uterine rupture or placental separation,[2] he concluded from his examination that the pain did not indicate any impending danger to the mother or child. In arriving at this assessment, Figge also relied on the fact that in his experience at least one or two

---

2. This occurs when the placenta detaches from the uterine wall.

patients a year similarly suffered from undiagnosed pain, and that such pain always resolved itself on the baby's birth.

At about this time Janice made her second request for a cesarean, and Figge responded that he wanted to give the labor some additional time. Janice complained to Figge about her pain, and again requested a cesarean. Figge responded something to the effect that if he "gave every woman who was in labor who asked for one a section, they'd all do it." Janice felt intimidated by Figge's abrupt attitude, and further that they were not "on the same team." In her weakened condition Janice did not pursue the matter further.

Figge testified that while he knew that Janice was experiencing abdominal discomfort and irregular contractions, and while he felt that Janice would have chosen a cesarean if given the choice,[3] he did not grant her

---

3. The trial transcript reads:

> Q. And you encouraged her to continue on with the trial of labor at that point?
>
> A. I explained to her what I thought the situation was and what we could do to further ascertain information regarding that, and I did not think that it was unsafe to proceed.
>
> Q. You fully recognized at the time that you had that conversation with her from what you could tell of her demeanor and where she was at in this process that had she — had you given her the choice of going to a cesarean or to continue on with a vaginal delivery that she would have opted for the cesarean, correct?

(Cont'd)

request because he felt that a cesarean was not medically indicated at the time. Figge also testified, however, that he would have performed the procedure if Janice had persisted in requesting it.

About 2 p.m. it became clear to Figge that Janice was in a "hypotonic" pattern, which meant that she was not going to make progress with labor. Figge testified that there were two alternatives at this time: to correct the problem with Pitocin, a labor-inducing drug, or perform a cesarean. Although the Schreibers had recently requested a cesarean, Figge encouraged them to hang on, and testified that he believed they acquiesced in his decision because they stopped resisting his recommendation to wait.

Janice was then given Pitocin to stimulate the labor process. Pitocin was administered in increasing amounts until 3:40 p.m., when the fetal heart beat dropped. Shortly after 4 p.m. an emergency cesarean was performed, and Kimberly was born a spastic quadriplegic. It is stipulated that had Kimberly been born by cesarean prior to 3:29 p.m. she would have been born healthy and normal.

The Schreibers' initial claim against Figge alleged both medical malpractice and a violation of the informed consent

---

(Cont'd)

A. Being in labor, being uncomfortable, she would have done it just simply because of discomfort.

Q. In any event, it was apparent to you that she would have done so?

A. That's correct.

statute. Prior to trial, however, the Schreibers dropped their medical malpractice claim. Our inquiry on appeal therefore does not concern whether Figge's treatment was appropriate, but only whether the Schreibers have a successful claim under the informed consent statute.

The trial court found that Janice had given her informed consent to the VBAC prior to labor, a finding not challenged on appeal. The court also concluded that Figge had no duty to obtain a new informed consent during labor. The court determined that such a duty would only arise if the medical situation changed in such a way as to increase the risks involved. While acknowledging that a cesarean was medically viable at the time Janice requested one, the court determined that there was no change in the situation sufficient to trigger a new duty to obtain Janice's informed consent.

For purposes of appeal, the trial court addressed additional questions that its judgment otherwise made unnecessary. First, the trial court found that Janice was denied a choice among treatments that afternoon. The court noted that Janice's "consent was not solicited and it was not obtained." Further, the court found that Janice would have opted for a cesarean that afternoon if Figge had given her a choice. The court believed that Janice's failure to pursue it because of her stress, discomfort, and perception that Figge's attitude was brusque was entirely credible. Second, the court found that the Schreibers had not established any causation between an assumed informed consent violation and subsequent damages. The trial court then dismissed the Schreibers' claims. The Schreibers appeal.

Appendix B

The Schreibers contend that they were denied the right to informed consent when Janice's requests for a cesarean were refused. They claim that under the informed consent statute Figge was not permitted to ignore Janice's clear request for a change in medically viable treatments.[4] Figge responds that he met his informed consent obligations because Janice initially chose the VBAC procedure and never actually withdrew her consent to that procedure, and further argues that a cesarean was not a medically viable alternative when Janice requested it.

Our standard of review in this case is straightforward: the trial court's factual findings are reviewed under a clearly erroneous standard, and we will give due regard to that court's ability to assess witness credibility. Section 805.17(2), STATS. Such factual findings will be upheld as long as they are supported by any credible evidence or reasonable inferences that can be drawn therefrom. *Estate of Cavanaugh v. Andrade*, 202 Wis. 2d 290, 306, 550 N.W.2d 103, 110 (1996). The trial court's conclusions of law, however, are entitled to no deference, and are reviewed by this court under a de novo standard. *Ball v. District No. 4 Area Bd.*, 117 Wis. 2d 529, 537, 345 N.W.2d 389, 394 (1984).

The Wisconsin informed consent law states:

> Any physician who treats a patient shall inform the patient about the availability of all alternate,

---

4. In the alternative, the Schreibers argue that Figge at least had a duty to either provide additional information or to clearly offer her a choice. Our conclusion that Figge could not refuse Janice's request makes resolution of these issues unnecessary.

viable medical modes of treatment and about the benefits and risks of these treatments. The physician's duty to inform the patient under this section does not require disclosure of:

(1) Information beyond what a reasonably well-qualified physician, in a similar medical classification would know.

(2) Detailed technical information that in all probability a patient would not understand.

(3) Risks apparent or known to the patient.

(4) Extremely remote possibilities that might falsely or detrimentally alarm the patient.

(5) Information in emergencies where failure to provide treatment would be more harmful to the patient than treatment.

(6) Information in cases where the patient is incapable of consenting.

Section 448.30, STATS. This statute imposes on physicians, before they subject their patients to medical treatment, the duty to explain all alternate, viable procedures to the patients and to warn them of any material risks or dangers inherent in or collateral to the proposed treatment. This is required to enable the patient to make an intelligent and informed choice about whether to follow the physician's recommendation or to select some other medically acceptable treatment alternative. *Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 173-74, 531 N.W.2d 70, 78 (1995) (citing

Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 68 Wis. 2d 1, 12-13, 227 N.W.2d 647, 653-54 (1975)).[5]

Where there are two or more medically acceptable treatment approaches to a particular medical problem, the informed consent doctrine, medical ethics, and the standard of care all provide that a competent patient has the absolute right to select from among these treatment options after being informed of the relative risks and benefits of each approach. Basic to the informed consent doctrine is that a physician has a legal, ethical and moral duty to respect patient autonomy and to provide only authorized medical treatment. *See Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 169, 531 N.W.2d at 76; *see also In re Guardianship of L.W.*, 167 Wis. 2d 53, 68, 482 N.W.2d 60, 65 (1992) (recognizing right to self-determination). The corollary to this principle is that it is inappropriate for physicians to pursue a treatment alternative other than the one to which their patient has given consent. This means that unless the patient consents to the physician's recommended treatment approach, the physician may not proceed with that approach even if the physician personally believes the recommended approach to be in the patient's best interests.[6] *See Bankert v. United States*, 937 F.Supp. 1169, 1173 (D. Md. 1996).

---

5. In 1981, the Wisconsin legislature codified the Scaria standard, *Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975), in § 448.30, STATS. *See* Laws of 1981, ch. 375, § 2 (effective May 7, 1982).

6. The dissent suggests this opinion compels a doctor to undertake a course treatment the doctor believes is medically

(Cont'd)

Appendix B

The doctrine of informed consent "stems from the fundamental notion of the right to bodily integrity: '[e]very human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his [or her] own body.' " *Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 156, 531 N.W.2d at 76 (quoting *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hosp.*, 105 N.E. 92, 93 (N.Y. 1914), *overruled on other grounds by Bing v. Thunig*, 143 N.E.2d 3 (N.Y. 1957)). The Wisconsin informed consent statute seeks to achieve this goal of patient autonomy by insuring the patient has sufficient information to allow for a meaningful choice among medically viable treatments. *Id.* at 174-75, 531 N.W.2d at 78 (the doctor must provide information "reasonably necessary for a patient to intelligently exercise his or her *choice* regarding medical treatment.") (Emphasis added.)

The deference *Martin* pays to the patient's right to choose her or his treatment is important because it demonstrates that the informed consent statute protects more than merely the patient's right to obtain information. It

---

(Cont'd)

inadvisable. We are reluctant to enter into a debate as to whether Figge believed it was medically inadvisable to perform a cesarean. It is our opinion that under the informed consent doctrine, a doctor's personal belief as to the best approach cannot outweigh the patient's right to select a medically viable treatment. In any event, our reading of his testimony is that Figge was willing to perform a cesarean only if he felt it would be safer than continuing with labor. He felt it was his "obligation to try and deliver her safely vaginally" unless something occurred to indicate that it would be safer to perform a cesarean. However, at no time did he state that it would have been medically inadvisable to perform the cesarean.

would be an absurd result indeed if we were to hold that a doctor could meet his or her obligations under the informed consent statute simply by providing information to the patient while ignoring the patient's ultimate choice.[7] Therefore, in addition to protecting the patient's right to obtain information, the informed consent statute must protect the patient's right to choose a medically viable treatment and have that choice respected by her or his doctor.

We further believe that this right to determine one's own treatment and have that choice respected applies regardless of when the choice is made. A competent patient's right to select from among medically acceptable treatment alternatives also encompasses the right to change one's mind about the treatment approach selected. "A competent patient who has had two prior cesarean sections has the right to consent or withhold consent to a trial of labor." *See generally Bankert*, 937 F.Supp. at 1174. There is nothing about pregnancy or the onset of the labor process that automatically renders a woman incapable of rational thought or unable to participate in competent decision-making with respect to which medically viable treatment will be followed.

The facts of this case reveal that Figge failed to respect Janice's right to choose her treatment. The trial court found that Janice at least three times requested a change in

---

7. "[I]t is a fundamental rule of statutory construction that any result that is absurd or unreasonable must be avoided." *State ex rel. Reimann v. Circuit Court for Dane County*, 214 Wis. 2d 604, 571 N.W.2d 385, 391 (1997).

treatment; that the treatment sought was medically viable; that Janice's explanation for ceasing in her efforts to exercise her choice was "entirely credible"; and that Janice would have chosen a cesarean if Figge had offered her a choice. Under these circumstances Figge could not ignore Janice and substitute his own choice for hers.

The more difficult question for us is whether Janice's right to choose and control her treatment prevented Figge from refusing to perform the cesarean when she requested it. Keeping in mind that a cesarean remained a medically viable alternative, we conclude that under the specific facts of this case Figge could not refuse the request.[8] Figge had a duty to either perform the cesarean or to obtain Janice's consent to continue with the vaginal delivery when she requested the medically viable alternative treatment.

We do not believe our decision today will lead us, as Figge and the dissent suggest, toward the perceived dangers of a treatment on demand system. Nor does our decision raise any additional complexities in a doctor-patient relationship. To show this, it is helpful to again state what this case is not. First, this is not a case in which a doctor is ethically opposed to performing a certain medical treatment. Figge routinely performed cesareans as a part of his medical practice, including two specifically with Schreiber prior to this pregnancy. Further, Figge had initially given Janice

---

8. We do not address whether Figge could have also met his informed consent duty under these circumstances by finding a doctor willing to perform the cesarean, because that argument was not raised.

the opportunity to elect a cesarean prior to labor, and testified that he would have performed one during labor if Janice had persisted in demanding one. Second, for the same reasons, this is not a case in which the requested medical treatment falls outside the doctor's practice and experience.

Instead, this is a case involving a patient who has been given a free choice by her doctor between two medically viable treatment options prior to labor, initially chooses one, but then changes her mind in the face of an unexpected change of circumstances that is inconsistent with or outside the patient's previous experience in similar circumstances. The doctor, although perfectly able and willing to follow the patient's wishes, and although the patient chose a medically viable alternative that had been offered to her by this doctor earlier, nonetheless ignored his patient and substituted his own choice for hers.

We also believe that another critical fact involved in this case sufficiently limits our holding: Janice was in labor at the time she made her request. As Figge points out in his brief, this is a "unique" case because labor involves a lengthy and painful process that the patient undergoes without a general anesthetic. Because of this critical fact, we must affirm Janice's right to choose a cesarean. First, Janice's labor obviously limited her ability to search for and find a doctor willing to perform the requested treatment.[9] Second, Janice's labor and painful condition

---

9. The record indicates that Janice's upper abdominal pain during labor was so severe at times that she could not get out of bed without assistance.

limited her ability to continually demand a change in treatment, as Figge expected her to do. Third, Janice could not be expected to expressly withdraw her consent to the VBAC until she could find a doctor willing to perform a cesarean. Therefore, we cannot conclude, as Figge suggests, that there was no informed consent violation in light of Janice's failure to clearly withdraw her consent to the VBAC. She practically could not do so until it became clear that Figge or another doctor would honor her request for a cesarean.

Figge offers three reasons why we should not hold that his refusal to abide by Janice's request violated her right to informed consent. First, he disputes the trial court's factual finding that a cesarean was a medically viable form of treatment when Janice requested it. We see little merit to this argument. Most importantly, Figge's view on appeal would directly contradict the parties' stipulation that Kimberly would have been born healthy and normal if the cesarean had been performed before 3:29 p.m. Furthermore, Figge's own testimony that he would have performed a cesarean if Janice had continued to demand the procedure indicates that the procedure remained a medically viable treatment option. Finally, because a cesarean was obviously viable at both ends of the timeline, at the beginning during the prenatal conference and again at the end when it was actually performed, it could reasonably be inferred that this treatment was also viable throughout the timeline. We therefore uphold the trial court's finding because it is supported by credible evidence.

Figge next argues that he was within his rights to make recommendations to Janice,[10] and that Janice appeared to acquiesce because she stopped making demands for a cesarean. We affirm the trial court's implicit finding that Janice did not acquiesce. The trial court found that Janice was not given a choice and, further, that if she had been given a choice she would have elected a cesarean. This finding is supported by credible evidence. As the trial court noted, Janice's failure to pursue the matter after making three requests was entirely credible in light of Figge's brusque demeanor and her considerable pain.

While we agree that a doctor can, and indeed should, make treatment recommendations, this responsibility cannot be substituted for providing the patient with a meaningful choice. A doctor should not be permitted to wear down a patient by continually advancing the doctor's position, nor should a doctor be permitted to stand behind an incapacitated patient's inability to surmount a brusque, dismissive demeanor. It is also important to recall that Figge avoided offering Janice a choice that afternoon even though it was apparent to him that she would have continued to ask for a cesarean.[11] On these facts we conclude that the trial court's implicit finding of no acquiescence is supported by credible evidence.

Figge's final argument is that even if he violated Janice's right to informed consent, there are no damages.

---

10. *See Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 181-82, 531 N.W.2d 70, 81 (1995).

11. *See* note 3, *supra*.

In support of his argument, Figge refers us to both Wisconsin case law establishing an objective standard of causation in informed consent cases and the trial court's finding that a reasonable patient in Janice's position would not have elected a cesarean. We are not persuaded.

We begin by acknowledging that all Wisconsin informed consent cases addressing the causation issue have followed an objective test. *See, e.g., Scaria*, 68 Wis. 2d at 12, 227 N.W.2d at 654-55. We do not believe, however, that these cases control the outcome in this case because they addressed a question different from the one before us. Notably, all these prior informed consent cases focused on whether the information given to the patient was sufficient. When those cases concluded that the information given was insufficient, the court was required to determine whether that violation actually caused the damages complained of. In other words, as the *Martin* court explained, the question was then whether it "would have made a difference" if the patient was given the correct information. *Id.* at 182, 531 N.W.2d at 81.[12] We do not believe that such an inquiry is necessary in this case.

As we have noted, Wisconsin adheres to the "fundamental notion of the right to bodily integrity." *Id.* at 169, 531 N.W.2d at 76. We are unwilling to apply an objective standard in a case such as this where the patient clearly expressed her treatment choice, and where that

---

12. This causation question is generally answered by a finding that a reasonable person would not have consented to the doctor's proposed treatment had the patient been fully informed of all available treatments. *See* Wis J I — Civil 1023.3.

choice was simply ignored. We are unwilling to allow a doctor to hide behind the question of what a "reasonable" patient would have done where the doctor fails to respect a patient's choice among medically viable treatment alternatives, and where that failure causes damages. Because the parties stipulated that Kimberly would have been born healthy and normal if Figge had not refused Janice's request that afternoon, we conclude that damages resulted from this breach of the informed consent statute.

We therefore conclude, on the specific facts before us, that Figge could not refuse Janice's request for a cesarean. His refusal to abide by Janice's fundamental right to choose her own method of treatment constitutes a violation of the Wisconsin informed consent statute, and damages flowed from that violation without regard to the "objective" standard of causation.

By the Court. — Judgment reversed and cause remanded for a hearing on damages.

MYSE, J. (*dissenting*). I enthusiastically endorse the majority's discussion of the patient's right to determine her or his course of treatment. However, I respectfully dissent from the majority's holding that under certain circumstances a doctor can be compelled to undertake a course of treatment the doctor believes is medically inadvisable. This is not, and cannot be, the law. It is neither supported by the informed consent statute nor sensibly grounded in public policy.

Appendix B

The informed consent statute is as follows:

> Any physician who treats a patient shall inform the patient about the availability of all alternate, viable medical modes of treatment and about the benefits and risks of these treatments. The physician's duty to inform the patient under this section does not require disclosure of:
>
> (1) Information beyond what a reasonably well-qualified physician in a similar medical classification would know.
>
> (2) Detailed technical information that in all probability a patient would not understand.
>
> (3) Risks apparent or known to the patient.
>
> (4) Extremely remote possibilities that might falsely or detrimentally alarm the patient.
>
> (5) Information in emergencies where failure to provide treatment would be more harmful to the patient than treatment.
>
> (6) Information in cases where the patient is incapable of consenting.

Section 448.30, STATS. This statute codified the standard set forth in *Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975). *See Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 173-74, 531 N.W.2d 70, 78 (1995).

Appendix B

The Wisconsin informed consent statute cannot be fairly read to compel either Figge or any other doctor to perform a treatment the doctor does not believe is medically indicated. In interpreting a statute our goal is to ascertain the intent of the legislature. *UFE, Inc. v. LIRC*, 201 Wis. 2d 274, 281, 548 N.W.2d 57, 60 (1996). The first step of this process is to look at the language of the statute. *Id.* If the plain meaning of the statute is clear, we should simply apply that meaning to the facts before it. *Id.* at 281-82, 548 N.W.2d at 60.

The plain language of the informed consent statute merely requires the doctor to provide the patient with information sufficient to allow the patient to either consent or withhold consent to the doctor's proposed medical treatment. This much was said in *Scaria*. There the court stated:

> The right to be recognized and protected is the right of the patient to consent or not to consent to a proposed medical treatment or procedure.
>
> . . . .
>
> In short, the duty of the doctor is to make such disclosures as appear reasonably necessary under circumstances then existing to enable a reasonable person under the same or similar circumstances confronting the patient at the time of disclosure to intelligently exercise his right to consent or to refuse the treatment or procedure proposed.

Id. at 12-13, 227 N.W.2d at 653-54. The plain language of the informed consent statute and *Scaria* demonstrate that there was no intent to require a doctor to perform medical treatment on demand. Figge should not be held liable for failing to do so here.

The majority attempts to create a right to treatment on demand in this case by relying on the fundamental notion of the right to bodily integrity. Quoting from *Martin*, the majority adopts the position that "[e]very human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his [or her] own body." This is rather ironic because the majority proceeds to compel a doctor to perform a treatment the doctor does not believe is medically indicated and does not want to do. In the instant case, Figge determined that "there was no real danger" as a result of Janice's upper abdominal pain, and therefore believed "that there was no real indication to proceed to a cesarean" when Janice requested it. Figge's refusal to perform the cesarean was based on his belief that it was bad medical practice to perform a cesarean based on complaints of pain alone. If his medical judgment concerning the appropriateness of a cesarean was incorrect, Figge may be liable in a medical malpractice claim. But Figge's refusal to carry out a treatment that he believes is contraindicated does not implicate the informed consent statute.

The informed consent statute requires the doctor to explain all viable, medical modes of treatment. This recognizes that there may be a number of feasible approaches to a specific medical problem. But simply because a medical procedure is feasible does not make

such a procedure preferable or even desirable. We have recognized this in several cases by reaffirming the doctor's right to make recommendations and even persuade the patient to follow the doctor's superior medical judgment. *See, e.g., Martin*, 192 Wis. 2d at 181, 531 N.W.2d at 81 ("The doctor might decide against the alternate treatments or care, [she or] he might try to persuade the patient against utilizing them, but [she or] he must inform them when a reasonable person would want to know."). Of course, the patient is entitled to know about and even to elect other medical procedures that are available but not recommended. I do not believe, however, that this right encompasses the right to compel a given doctor to perform a specific treatment. The doctor should retain the right to refuse to follow a course of treatment that contravenes the doctor's opinion as to proper medical practice and procedure.

Contrary to the Schreibers' argument, affirming this right of the doctor does not correspondingly render meaningless the right of the patient to direct her or his treatment. If a doctor refuses to follow the patient's choice of treatment the patient remains able to seek another doctor willing to accept the choice of treatment. While I acknowledge that under certain circumstances a patient may not be able to effectively choose among all treatment options, there is nothing in the informed consent statute to suggest that a doctor must follow the patient's request in those cases. By refusing to include such a provision in the statute I believe the legislature intended to balance the doctor's right to control one's own medical practice with the patient's right to control one's own treatment.

Appendix B

I further believe that the majority decision is bad public policy. Such a decision can only work to raise additional complexities in an already complex system of legal entanglements with the patient-doctor relationship. By limiting its result to the facts, the majority gives little guidance to doctors with respect to this new duty. It is unclear when a doctor will have to follow a patient's demands for treatment, and the majority opinion establishes no criteria that will assist the doctor in making this determination. For all these reasons, I would hold that Figge violated no duty by refusing to perform the cesarean at the time it was requested.

APPENDIX C — AMENDED ORDER FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, ONEIDA COUNTY DATED NOVEMBER 20, 1996 AND FILED NOVEMBER 22, 1996

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CIRCUIT COURT
ONEIDA COUNTY

Case No. 92-CV-298

KIMBERLY SCHREIBER, a minor by her Guardian ad Litem, John W. Krueger; GERALD SCHREIBER; and JANICE SCHREIBER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN, INC., a Wisconsin corporation; PAUL K. H. FIGGE, JR., M.D.; WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND, a Wisconsin corporation; EMPLOYERS HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, a Wisconsin corporation; STATE OF WISCONSIN, a sovereign body,

Defendants.

AMENDED ORDER FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT

The above-captioned action having been tried to the Court by stipulation after selection of a jury but before

testimony, with all parties waiving their right to a Jury trial as to all issues, and the parties further stipulating to a bifurcation of the trial with the liability determination only to be made by the Honorable James W. Karch, and the Court having heard and considered all of the evidence presented during said trial which began on April 26, 1996 and ended on May 6, 1996, and the parties providing post trial briefs and other submissions with the final submissions from the parties having been received by the Court on July 26, 1996; and the Court thereafter having considered the evidence received during the course of the trial and upon due consideration, pursuant to the provisions of Section 805.17, Wisconsin Statutes, rendered and entered its DECISION, FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND JUDGMENT dated September 24, 1996, and the Court having previously ordered that the Plaintiffs' Complaint be dismissed on its merits and with costs, and the Clerk of Court having approved costs in the sum of $7,734.04, and based upon the above and foregoing, and on the Motion of Randall J. Sandfort, Attorney for Defendants, Dr. Paul K. H. Figge, Jr., Physicians Insurance Company of Wisconsin, Inc., and Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund;

IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED, ORDERED AND DECREED that the Complaint of the Plaintiffs, and all causes of action stated therein, be and the same hereby is dismissed on its merits, with prejudice, and that the Defendant, Physicians Insurance Company of Wisconsin, Inc., have and receive judgment against the Plaintiffs, Gerald Schreiber and Janice Schreiber, for its costs and disbursements as permitted by law in the sum of $7,734.04.

Appendix C

Dated at Baraboo, Wisconsin this 20th day of November, 1996.

BY THE COURT:

s/ James W. Karch
Honorable James W. Karch
Reserve Judge

APPENDIX D — DECISION, FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, ONEIDA COUNTY DATED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CIRCUIT COURT
ONEIDA COUNTY

Case No. 92 CV 298

KIMBERLY SCHREIBER, a minor, by her Guardian ad Litem, John W. Krueger, GERALD SCHREIBER, and JANICE SCHREIBER,

vs.

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN, INC., a Wisconsin corporation, PAUL K. H. FIGGE, JR., M.D., WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND, a Wisconsin corporation, EMPLOYERS HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, a Wisconsin corporation, and STATE OF WISCONSIN, a sovereign body,

Defendants.

DECISION,
FINDINGS of FACT,
CONCLUSIONS of LAW
and
JUDGMENT

Appendix D

I. POSTURE OF CASE

This medical malpractice case was tried to the court by stipulation after the selection of a jury but before any testimony. The parties agreed to waive their right to a jury trial as to all issues, with the liability determination only to be made by the undersigned judge and any necessary damage findings to be made in the manner recited in detail into the record. Testimony was then taken on six days, beginning April 26, 1996, and ending May 6, 1996.

Following the close of testimony briefs and proposed Findings and Conclusions have been provided, with the final submissions received on July 26, 1996.

II. SUMMARY OF FACTS

Prior to the incident forming the basis for the suit, the plaintiff Janice Schreiber had had two children, each delivered by cesarean section, on November 9, 1981, and February 13, 1984. The first section was due to insufficient progress in labor and the second by advance election in accordance with the general practice at the time.

In early 1988, when the plaintiff was again expecting, vaginal deliveries following sections were commonly being attempted, and during the prenatal consultation the decision was made to do so here, that is, to attempt a VBAC, a vaginal birth after cesarean.

The defendant Dr. Paul Figge provided care to the plaintiff throughout all three pregnancies.

Appendix D

Mrs. Schreiber began experiencing labor pains in the evening of June 24, 1988, and was admitted to the hospital at 4:10 A.M. on June 25, 1988. Dr. Figge first saw her at the hospital in a corridor at about 8:00 A.M. and she told him that she had changed her mind and would like to go with a section. His response was that they'd go to her room and he would check her out, which was done, and there was no further discussion at that point regarding the matter.

The progress in her dilation was limited, and Dr. Figge then performed an amniotomy, a breaking of the amniotic fluid sac, an aid to the progress of labor. Shortly thereafter the plaintiff began experiencing severe upper epigastric pain that she had not had in her prior deliveries and that she did not associate with her contractions. Pain medication was first administrated at 9:30 A.M., with limited relief provided. In dispute is whether Dr. Figge again saw her shortly after this time.

At 1:00 P.M. Dr. Figge returned to her room, determined that she had made insufficient progress, and attempted to ascertain the source of the pain. He conducted an examination and concluded that the pain was not related to a factor that would suggest impending danger, although he could not determine the precise cause. He then directed the administration of Pitocin in an attempt to stimulate her labor.

At that point the plaintiff was asking for a section, but the defendant told her and her husband, the plaintiff Gerald Schreiber, that she should continue to attempt to achieve her goal of vaginal delivery.

Appendix D

At 3:40 P.M. the fetal heart beat dropped and a section was performed at 4:03 P.M., but a catastrophic injury had already occurred, depriving the fetus of oxygen and resulting in the child, the plaintiff Kimberly Schreiber, being a spastic quadriplegic.

The parties have stipulated that if a cesarean section had been performed prior to 3:29 P.M., Kimberly would be a healthy and normal child.

III. ISSUES

When this action was commenced on September 25, 1992, the complaint made general allegations regarding negligence on the part of Dr. Figge. However, by correspondence of January 4, 1996, and March 21, 1996, confirmed subsequently on the record, plaintiffs' counsel advised that they were no longer pursuing any medical mismanagement claim and that the only theory of negligence was directed to informed consent.

The parties are in agreement that in connection with the prenatal election for a VBAC, the initial inquiry is whether Dr. Figge was negligent in failing to make such disclosures to Janice Schreiber as would enable a reasonable person under the circumstances confronting her to exercise the right to elect between an attempt at vaginal birth and an elective repeat cesarean section.

An affirmative answer to this question is followed by a query as to whether a reasonable person, placed in the position of Janice Schreiber and receiving adequate

disclosures, would not have consented to the attempt at a vaginal birth.

As to the 1:00 P.M. consultation, the plaintiffs present the same two questions relating now to continuing with the attempt at vaginal delivery or trial of labor as opposed to proceeding immediately to a section.

The defendants' position is that Dr. Figge was under no duty to have an informed consent discussion with the plaintiff at this time period so that no other inquiries need to be answered.

As stated, the parties have stipulated as to medical cause.

IV. RESOLUTION

In summary, I find that the prenatal disclosures were not inadequate and that the defendant had no duty to conduct an informed consent discussion with the plaintiff during labor.

Accordingly I determine that the complaint be dismissed.

V. AUTHORITIES

Wisconsin cases on informed consent are:

Trogun v Fruchtman, 58 Wis.2d 156, 207 N.W.2d 297 (1973)

Appendix D

Scaria v St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., 68 Wis.2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975)

Martin v Richards, 192 Wis.2d 156, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995)

Johnson v Kokemoor, 199 Wis.2d 615, 545 N.W.2d 495 (1996)

Finley v Culligan, 201 Wis.2d 611, 548 N.W.2d 854 (Ct App 1996)

Kuklinski v Rodriguez, (Ct App 7/2/96, publication ordered 8/27/96)

Section 448.30, Wis. stats. (Codifying *Scaria*)

VI. DECISION

This has been an unusually difficult case, primarily because of the blurring of the lines between diagnosis or medical management on the one hand and informed consent on the other. The submissions and statements on the record throughout demonstrate this conflict, with the plaintiffs maintaining that their evidence was directed to informed consent, the defendants frustrated from their belief otherwise and my struggling with attempting to properly analyze it.

An example of the difficulty in examining the case efficiently is the plaintiffs' position expressed at page 3 of their post-trial brief and page 1 of their reply post-trial brief

that the true issue in this case is whether or not proceeding to a cesarean section at 1:00 P.M. was a viable medical alternative. Would that the resolution could be that easy. Of course it was; it was beginning at 4:10 that morning. I do not understand the defendants to suggest otherwise.

Another area of concern is in evaluating the credibility of the Schreibers and Dr. Figge. Parties always have a self-interest in their testimony. But here for the Schreibers at least their interest is especially compelling from the devastating loss they have suffered, of a healthy child, and the overwhelming burden they now have in caring for Kimberly.

But, in accord with the principal rationale for the objective nature of the cause test, I am not to permit the plaintiffs' hindsight after a bad result to drive the resolution of the case.

At the same time Dr. Figge's testimony also would be expected to be exculpatory, but I do not view it in the same light.

Plaintiffs suggest a falsus in uno approach to Dr. Figge's testimony based on three separate instances: the claimed 10:30 A.M examination, the cause of the damage to Kimberly and the etiology of the epigastric pain.

I viewed Dr. Figge on the stand and found him to be a credible witness. While I think it more likely than not that the examination did not take place, I accept that Dr. Figge believed that it did when he testified. Likewise I am not

persuaded by the other challenges. I reject the invitation to discount other areas of his testimony.

The initial question for a jury, and likewise for me, as stated at III above, addresses the prenatal information given by Dr. Figge to Mrs. Schreiber. Specifically, the plaintiffs complain that the information conveyed should have included (Plaintiffs' post trial brief, pages 13, 14 and 18):

1. A reference to the possibility of uterine rupture.

2. Advice that once a VBAC was elected, she could not change her mind.

3. The lack of experience of Dr. Figge with multiple VBACs.

4. The 1988 ACOG (American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists) guidelines not allowing a doctor to encourage a multiple VBAC.

5. The risk for a section after a trial of labor being greater than that for an elective repeat section.

6. A lack of sufficient experience in the literature to support the efficacy of multiple VBACs.

I agree that on the record here the possibility of uterine rupture is a topic to be mentioned. There was no particular disagreement with this, even though the risk was extremely slight and no expert professed to have had any any significant personal experience with it happening.

I consider that this was done here. I appreciate that there was a direct conflict in the testimony on this. However, I believe the defendant's account more credible. He testified that he did mention it and in fact that it would be very difficult to talk with a patient about electing a vaginal birth without talking about the reasons for the change in practice in allowing them to attempt a vaginal birth without mentioning uterine rupture.

On the other hand, Mrs. Schreiber, while firm in her position that uterine rupture was never mentioned, nonetheless testified that she did not remember everything said to her about VBACs, and I can well imagine that prior to this episode the topic of a uterine rupture could well be one that would not stay with her.

Plaintiffs assert that the defendant's testimony on this is contradicted by his discovery deposition testimony. I do not agree. Contrary to the assertion on page 8 of plaintiffs' reply brief, he was not asked what he told Mrs. Schreiber. He may have included a reference to her in his answer, but it is not limited to her and there was no follow-up by plaintiffs' counsel.

As to the second point above, I consider that the defendant did not adopt this position. I believe that he did not comply with the plaintiff's 1:00 P.M. request, not because he never permitted a change of mind during labor, but because he believed that she should continue to deliver vaginally, in accordance with the procedure she had initially determined upon.

As to number three, I do not accept that the defendant had to inform her of his lack of experience with multiple VBACs. I consider that this case is readily distinguishable from *Johnson* where the doctor's lack of experience in the particular surgery involved was held to be included within the information to be given the patient. But underlying that conclusion, besides the extreme fact situation involved, was compelling testimony about the necessity for such experience and the significantly increased risks in being operated upon by one with his limited background.

Here there was no such testimony suggesting the risks were greater because of Dr. Figge's lack of specific experience with multiple VBACs. Rather the credible testimony was that this was more a question of the general competence and experience of the doctor in his obstetric practice, and no one has suggested criticism of Dr. Figge in this regard.

Mrs. Schreiber testified otherwise, of course, but I doubt that a reasonable person would expect to have this information volunteered to them, in view of the absence of any increased risk therefrom.

As to number four, this information would not have been required because it is not accurate. It repeats a position expressed on several occasions in plaintiffs' post-trial submissions that is premised on the ACOG guidelines being mandatory. They are not, of course, as I thought was clearly established during the trial.

Granted, the guidelines recommended that doctors not encourage multiple VBACs, but I am not persuaded that a

patient needs to be advised of that. I do not recall any witness so testifying, nor do plaintiffs point to any.

Items five and six are more nebulous. There was considerable contradictory evidence regarding the relative risks of vaginal versus section after trial of labor versus elective repeat section deliveries. Any expectation that I can resolve this conflict is unrealistic, particularly since I do not find it necessary to do so.

Suffice it to say that I consider that Dr. Figge's discussions with plaintiff regarding the pros and cons on a number of occasions, as she testified to, her testimony that he informed her that one risk was a repeat section, her further testimony that she was aware that there was more of a risk with surgery, and his testimony at pages 21 to 31 of the trial transcript, which I accept, all are sufficient to satisfy his obligation in this regard. As I understood the testimony of the two defense experts at trial, Dr. Cruikshank and Dr. Meier, neither would have provided the information of concern here.

While not necessarily controlling on the point, I particularly note Exhibit 61, an ACOG bulletin of February, 1987, entitled "Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery", a patient information pamphlet for providing to one contemplating a VBAC. No risk of the type under consideration at items five and six appears.

In reference to the overall issue regarding the information conveyed, I conclude that I may consider that Dr. Giles, one of plaintiffs' experts, testified in a discovery

deposition at a point in time where the focus of the plaintiffs' case remained on medical management that he had reviewed the defendant's discovery deposition testimony regarding prenatal informed consent and had no criticism regarding the same. In his trial testimony there is the suggestion that if defendant's version is adopted it would comply, with the rupture risk being the main point of concern. And both Dr. Cruikshank and Dr. Meier suggested approval of the disclosures.

Also from Exhibit 61, the ACOG bulletin, is the advice that the main risk of a VBAC is rupture of the uterine scar, which is more likely if the scar is a classical vertical incision (not the situation here), and that although very uncommon this still may of itself be reason to avoid a VBAC. Further, that a rupture is still possible with a low transverse incision (our situation) but minimizes the risk from it.

I am, of course, to consider this from the point of view of what a reasonable person in similar circumstances to those of Mrs. Schreiber would want to know. However, in view of the expert testimony, I consider appropriate the following from *Scaria,* page 12:

> The disclosures which would be made by doctors of good standing, under the same or similar circumstances, are certainly relevant and material and we surmise would be adequate to fulfill the doctor's duty of disclosure in most instances.

I understand that in retrospect the plaintiff believes that she should have had more information. But in view of her

comfort level with Dr. Figge, as referred to in the next section dealing with cause, I find it unlikely that either she or any other reasonable person would really have considered and weighed all of these matters now complained of.

The burden of proof is on the plaintiffs to satisfy me to a reasonable certainty by the greater weight of the credible evidence, and I cannot determine that the information given by Dr. Figge in the prenatal period was not adequate.

If, however, the answer to this first question should be affirmative, then I consider the resolution of the second question, the legal cause.

I rely here on several aspects of the testimony:

1. Mrs. Schreiber testified that one of the reasons that she decided to choose VBAC was "because I felt really comfortable with what Dr. Figge was telling me" (TT p49), you do have a tendency to believe and follow the advice of your physician (TT p171), and "He had no problem with it at all, and because he had no problem with it at all, I was comfortable with it" (TT p176).

2. Dr. Giles responded to a question as to whether it would have been all right to manage Mrs. Schreiber as a VBAC patient with "Absolutely" (TT p59).

3. Dr. Giles continues to offer patients VBACs "enthusiastically" (TT p13), he strongly recommends them (TT p167), and 70% to 80% of his patients try it (TT p168).

4. Dr. Klaven, plaintiffs' other expert, testified that he would have accepted plaintiff as an appropriate patient (Video Transcript p101), and that in 70% of his cases a repeat section is not even an option, although it is not clear whether this was limited to one prior section mothers (VT p 93). In any event, a VBAC is his standard of delivery for two prior cesareans (VT p102).

I recognize that Mrs. Schreiber testified that she would not have elected VBAC if she had been aware of any of the risks. I would hardly have expected her to say otherwise. But as the case law points out, while her testimony on this is admissible, it may not threaten to dominate the findings. *Scaria.*

With the overwhelming support for VBACs and with her own statements regarding accepting her doctor's advice along with my own perceptions of the general tendency of reasonable people to look to their doctors for guidance and decision-making, as confirmed by the experiences of all of the medical witnesses, I am not persuaded that a reasonable person in her position with adequate information would not have consented to the attempt at vaginal birth.

Turning now to the 1:00 P.M. time period, the critical issue in view of the posture of the case is whether the defendant was bound to conduct an informed consent discussion with the plaintiff at this point.

The plaintiffs claim yes, because of her request for a section and because her changed condition had increased the risks.

Appendix D

As to the first, this aspect has come up regularly throughout the various conferences and hearings we have had in this case, with plaintiffs' counsel maintaining that the request triggers the application of sec. 448.30.

In plaintiffs' post-trial brief the following appears at page 1:

> Since it is clear that this alternative (a section delivery) was not made available to her at 1:00 p.m., the issue regarding the 1:00 p.m. conference is merely a legal one, did the informed consent duty apply at that time? If it did, then Janice Schreiber had the right to choose. It seems inconceivable that when the patient is requesting the alternative procedure that the informed consent duty would not apply at that time.

—

But how do I determine if the duty existed at that time as invoked by her request? No expert testimony was presented and neither side has provided any authority specifically on point. I have made an exhaustive search and cannot find any anywhere that addresses this concept of a proper response to a request as made here, either by way of initiating an informed consent discussion or otherwise. And this despite the comment appearing in 61 Am. Jur. 2d, Physicians, Surgeons, etc., section 187:

> The doctrine of informed consent has achieved a status in the law of medical malpractice unmatched in speed of growth and commentary.

Appendix D

Returning to the last sentence of the post-trial brief quote above, I observe that Mrs. Schreiber also made a request for a section at 8:00 A.M. that day which was not observed. It would seem that the same result should obtain in either case, but plaintiffs have not so argued.

I am satisfied to determine that once the procedure elected has been initiated, as here, a request for a change does not thereby require an informed consent discussion. At this point the election has been made and the procedure in progress. As defendant testified, his duty was to manage her labor and to help her achieve her goal as long as it was safe.

The other question presented then is whether in this ongoing procedure the presence of changed circumstances resulting in a change in the risk situation requires a renewed informed consent discussion regarding alternative modes of treatment.

The statute, sec. 448.30, does not provide a clear answer. The cases recited earlier all deal with either proposed surgery or alternative diagnostic or treatment methods. And again, no authority has been submitted, and I have not found any of assistance.

The conclusion I derive from the medical testimony presented is that a substantial change in the circumstances surrounding the patient ought to require a renewed informed consent discussion if there are alternative, viable medical modes of treatment.

The plaintiffs' two experts testified that these changed conditions and thus increased risks were present here.

The defendants' experts, the two already referred to plus Dr. Phelan as well as Dr. Figge, all took the position that the situation had not changed so that a consent discussion was not necessary. The obvious inference is that changed circumstances are in fact significant, which leads to the same position as the plaintiffs'. And this seems to me to be an appropriate conclusion.

Accordingly, I determine that following an informed consent to a specific treatment procedure, once the procedure has commenced, the duty of the doctor is to seek to achieve its goal, but if the situation changes to increase the risks presented to the patient and there are alternative, viable medical modes of treatment available, then a renewed discussion under sec. 448.30 needs to take place.

To consider this for our situation, a more detailed statement of the underlying facts is required.

Mrs. Schreiber began having light contractions at 10:00 P.M. the evening before delivery. She was admitted to the hospital at 4:10 A.M. At 8:50 A.M. Dr. Figge performed the amniotomy. At 9:10 A.M. pain started and at 9:30 A.M. pain medication administered with pain reported at 10:05 A.M. as slightly less. At noted earlier, the pain was reported as severe.

At 12:17 P.M. a different pain medication was administrated with a 12:40 P.M. report of more comfortable

and a 1:05 report of fairly comfortable. Pitocin was started at 1:48 P.M. Subsequently fetal distress was noted and at 4:03 P.M. an emergency cesarean was performed. (Exhibit 1, a time-line presentation from the nursing notes, exhibit 4.)

The plaintiff testified that at the examination by Dr. Figge at 1:00 P.M. she told him she wanted a section and his response was that he wanted to give it more time. She complained about the pain and he replied sharply, "I hear you, Jan." Shortly after that she again asked for a section and he responded, "If I gave every woman who was in labor who asked for one a section, they'd all do it". She felt that he was abrupt on these two exchanges, her feelings were hurt and she "kinda withdrew", not pursuing the matter any further.

Mr. Schreiber described the responses as snapping at her. He further related that on the second request, defendant said that things were ok and they should continue to give it more time.

Both Schreibers made it clear that relief from the pain was the motivation for requesting the section.

Dr. Figge's testimony was substantially in accord. He testified that at 1:00 P.M. she asked for a section and he responded that he'd do an examination and then they would discuss it.

After the exam he told her that there were no indications to proceed with a section at that point and that she should

give it the best chance. He also considered it appropriate to attempt to stimulate labor with Pitocin, which was done.

Dr. Figge testified that while he could not determine the cause of her upper abdominal pain, he was convinced from his examination that it was not related to either placental separation or uterine scar dehiscence, a weakening or partial tear of the scar from a prior section incision, although he could not rule out either with 100% certainty.

It should be noted that in plaintiff's first delivery in 1981 she was experiencing contractions at home for a extensive period of time, as I understood her testimony. She was admitted at 2:00 A.M., had a day of considerable contraction pain, received Pitosin for three hours and at 7:00 P.M. a section was elected.

Plaintiffs claim that there were two changed circumstances: the failure to progress in labor and the inability to ascertain the source of the pain.

None of the defendants' experts considered that either of these constituted such a change as to require a renewed discussion with the plaintiff. In general, they approved the examination made by defendant, agreed with his conclusions and considered that there were no increased risks and that there was no need to advise Mrs. Schreiber that the source of the pain was unknown.

Both of the plaintiffs' experts believed otherwise, that in fact that the circumstances had changed as to both points, and indeed that a section was mandated at that time.

Appendix D

In this connection I observe that each testified to this effect even with the knowledge that medical management was no longer in the case and presumably with the knowledge also that the court had entered an order in limine precluding any reference to the appropriateness of Dr. Figge's conduct in the management of the medical care provided to the plaintiff. (Giles trial transcript p210; Klavan video deposition transcript pp49, 70 and 72; transcript of motion hearing of April 12, 1996, p3.)

In evaluating the messages I certainly may evaluate the messengers, and in viewing their testimony I may consider their underlying point of view, the belief that defendant was wrong in not performing a section at 1:00 P.M.

As to the lack of progress in labor, I observe that here the plaintiff was in labor at the hospital for nine hours before the section delivery while in her first pregnancy she was in labor at the hospital for 17 hours before delivery by section for failure to progress.

It does not seem unreasonable to me to accept the testimony on behalf of Dr. Figge that the lack of progress was not a changed condition requiring a review of options.

As to the source of the pain, Dr. Figge was convinced it was not a threat to the fetus. He had had previous experience with unexplained pain during labor, and it had gone away after delivery. There was credible testimony from his experts in support of this determination and his conclusion that the risks were not increased.

Appendix D

Plaintiffs assert that in fact the cause of the pain was a dehiscence which confirms the increase of the risk at 1:00 P.M. But this is entirely conjecture; the cause of the pain was not established by the record at all, in my view.

I am satisfied to find that the circumstances had not changed so that the defendant was not required to obtain renewed consent to the choice of treatment. There was nothing to communicate; the risks had remained the same, as he viewed them.

However, if Dr. Giles and Dr. Klavan are correct, where does that leave us? With a faulty diagnosis, in my opinion, considering the precise nature of the plaintiffs' criticism in this regard.

Dr. Klavan articulates it as:

> . . . his failure to recognize that the trial — that the labor was not progressing was a medical problem, and that he had to rule out a separation of the scar because of the upper abdominal pain and the informed consent, otherwise I had no problem with the care he provided. I thought it was good. (Video transcript p123.)

The plaintiffs' reply post-trial brief at page 38 complains that "He was simply unable to determine the source of the pain", and at page 39 that "The doctor didn't have a clue as to what was causing the pain".

This, it seems to me, is diagnosis, which, of course, is care and treatment and is not in the case.

Appendix D

As discussed recently in *Finley* at page 628:

> A failure to diagnose is a form of medical malpractice. Citing. A failure to obtain informed consent is another discrete form of malpractice, requiring a consideration of additional and different factors."

I note with interest a statement in Treatise on Health Care Law, published by Matthew Bender, sec. 17.02(2)(a):

> Some claimants have attempted to convert instances of missed or erroneous diagnosis, which properly should be regarded as possible cases of medical negligence, into informed consent claims.

I am satisfied that this is the situation here.

While this concludes the discussion underlying my determinations, it seems appropriate to proceed to consider other factual matters here, in the event an appellate court disagrees with my conclusion that there was no informed consent duty at 1:00 P.M.

I conclude that the consent portion of this dialogue was missing. Plaintiff's consent was not solicited and it was not obtained. Defendants' post-trial brief at page 91 concedes as much, that there was no discussion in the context of a wholly elective choice.

I am also satisfied, as presumably the defendants would agree, that if the choice had been put to her squarely she

would have opted for a section. Her explanation for why she did not pursue it at the time in the stress of her physical discomfort and her perception of the brusque attitude of the defendant is entirely credible.

Thus any inquiry as to the adequacy of the information conveyed to her becomes irrelevant, in my opinion.

However, there may be concern with the next step, if a reasonable person placed in her position and receiving adequate disclosures would not have consented to continue in the attempt at vaginal birth.

From the point of view of Dr. Giles and Dr. Klavan, the obvious answer is yes. But I suggest that neither doctor would have disclosed any information to the patient except to announce that they were headed for surgery.

From the point of view of the defendant and his witnesses, however, the additional risks were minimal and the patient would be encouraged to continue. Taking into account the considerable testimony that without exception demonstrated the overwhelming willingness of patients to accept the recommendations of continuing, the answer here is negative.

VII FINDINGS OF FACT

1. I adopt as findings of fact the recitations of facts within Sections II and VI above.

2. The defendant Paul K. H. Figge was not negligent in failing to make such disclosures to the plaintiff Janice

Schreiber before the onset of labor was would enable a reasonable person to exercise the right to elect between an attempt at vaginal birth and an elective cesarean section.

VIII CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. I adopt as conclusions of law the legal determinations contained within Section VI above.

2. The defendant Paul K. H. Figge was under no duty under the circumstances to secure the informed consent of the plaintiff Janice Schreiber to a continuation of the trial of labor after its onset.

IX JUDGMENT

Upon the record and proceedings herein and upon the foregoing Decision, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED, That the complaint of the plaintiffs herein be dismissed on its merits, with costs.

Dated: September 24, 1996.

BY THE COURT,

s/James W. Karch
James W. Karch, Judge

APPENDIX E — ORDER OF THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION DATED APRIL 7, 1999

SUPREME COURT
OF WISCONSIN
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
110 East Main Street, Suite 215
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688
TELEPHONE: (608) 266-1880
TTY USERS: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529;
request (608) 266-1880
FACSIMILE: (608) 267-0640
Web Site: www.courts.state.wi.us

MARILYN L. GRAVES
CLERK

Date: April 07, 1999

To:

Paul J. Kelly
Schellinger & Doyle, S.C.
P.O. Box 464
Brookfield, WI 53008-0464

Richard A. Victor
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

Appendix E

Lynn R. Laufenberg
Cannon & Dunphy, S.C.
P.O. Box 1750
Brookfield, WI 53008

Susan R. Tyndall
Hinshaw & Culbertson
100 E. Wisconsin Ave., #2600
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4115

Dana J. Weis
Habush, Habush, Davis & Rottier
26 S. Brown St.
Rhinelander, WI 54501

Nancy M. Rottier
WI Academy of Trial Lawyers
44 East Mifflin Street, #103
Madison, WI 53703

The court has entered the following order:

Case No. **96-3676**
Kimberly Schreiber v. Physicians Ins. Co. of WI
Trial Court Case No. 92 CV 298

The court having considered the Motion for Reconsideration filed in the above matter,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion for Reconsideration is denied, with $50.00 costs.

Marilyn L. Graves
Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 29 1999
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(2)

No. 99-28

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN; PAUL K.H. FIGGE, JR., M.D.; WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND,

Petitioners,

v.

KIMBERLY SCHREIBER, a minor by her guardian ad litem, JOHN KRUEGER; GERALD SCHREIBER and JANICE SCHREIBER,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

RESPONDENTS' BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

D. JAMES WEIS
Counsel of Record
VIRGINIA M. ANTOINE
HABUSH, HABUSH, DAVIS & ROTTIER, S.C.
Attorneys for Respondents
26 South Brown Street
Rhinelander, Wisconsin 54501
(715) 365-1900

154156

Counsel Press LLC
FORMERLY LUTZ APPELLATE SERVICES
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

27pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Table of Cited Authorities iii

Table of Appendices v

Statement of the Case 1

A. Fundamental Facts 1

B. The Petition Misstates Some of the Facts of this Case. 3

1. The petitioners misstate the record when they contend that a VBAC in these circumstances is safer than a cesarean. 3

2. The petitioners misstate the record when they imply that Mrs. Schreiber had digestive pain unrelated to the ultimate rupture of the uterus. 4

3. The petitioners misstate the record when they assert that a uterine rupture was not occurring at the time Dr. Figge examined Mrs. Schreiber in the early afternoon. . . 4

4. The petitioners misstate the record when they contend that Mrs. Schreiber did not refuse to go forward with the VBAC and that the findings of the supreme court are contrary to the trial court in that regard. 5

Contents

	Page
Reasons for Denying the Writ	6
I. The Decision Of The Wisconsin Supreme Court Does Not Require Treatment On Demand.	6
II. The Petition Does Not Raise A Constitutional Or Federal Question.	10
A. The Wisconsin Decision Involves the Application of Wisconsin Statutory Tort Law and Does Not Implicate any Federal Right.	10
B. The Right of Bodily Integrity and/or Self-Determination Is Not Applicable to this Situation.	10
III. The Wisconsin Court's Decision Does Not Put Physicians At Risk For Medical Malpractice Claims.	12
IV. The Medical Examples Provided By The Petitioners Do Not Properly Reflect The Ruling Of The Wisconsin Court.	16
V. The Position Advocated By The Petitioners Would Result In The Violation Of The Constitutional Rights Of Medical Patients.	19
Conclusion	20

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, Inc., 462 U.S. 416 (1983) 11

Bankert v. United States, 937 F. Supp. 1169 (D. Md. 1996) 9

Canterbury v. Spence, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972) 9, 11

Cobbs v. Grant, 8 Cal. 3d 229, 502 P.2d 1, 104 Cal. Rptr. 505 (1972) 9

Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990) 11

Hurtado v. People of California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884) 11

Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977) 11

La Case v. Colier, 434 So. 2d 1039 (La. 1983) ... 9

Maher v. Roe, 432 U.S. 464 (1977) 11

Martin v. Richards, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995) 15

Natason v. Kline, 186 Kan. 393, 350 P.2d 1093, 187 Kan. 186, 354 P.2d 670 (1960) 9

Cited Authorities

	Page
Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973)	11
Rust v Sullivan, 500 U.S. 173 (1991)	11
Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 68 Wis. 2d 1, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975)	15
Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757 (1966)	11
Union Pacific Railroad v. Botsford, 141 U.S. 250 (1973)	9
Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)	11
Winston v. Lee, 470 U.S. 753 (1985)	11
Statute:	
Wis. Stat. § 448.30	*passim*
United States Constitution:	
Fourteenth Amendment	10, 11
Rule:	
United States Supreme Court Rule 15	3
Other Authorities:	
Wis. Admin. Code, sec. Med 18.02(3)	14
Wis. Admin. Code, sec. Med 18.03	15
Wis. J.I. — Civil 1023	13, 16, 17, 18

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Page

Appendix — Wisconsin Administrative Code Sec. Med 18.02 & 18.03 ..... 1a

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Fundamental Facts

The petitioners outline many of the facts of this case accurately, but fail to include facts of importance and inaccurately outline others. The respondents will supplement those facts as needed and point out the inaccuracies.

This case derives from a fundamentally simple fact situation. Janice Schreiber delivered her first two children by cesarean section. When she became pregnant a third time, she was given the option by Dr. Paul Figge of attempting a vaginal (VBAC — vaginal birth after cesarean) delivery. There is a risk of uterine rupture when a vaginal birth is attempted after a cesarean. (Pet. App. D at 54a, 55a). For that reason, either a vaginal delivery or a cesarean were reasonable medical options. Wisconsin informed consent law requires that a physician outline all alternative, viable medical modes of treatment, and, in fact, Dr. Figge discussed other options with Mrs. Schreiber. After talking with Dr. Figge Mrs. Schreiber decided, before going into labor, to try a VBAC. It is undisputed that if, prior to labor, Mrs. Schreiber had chosen to have a cesarean that Dr. Figge would have performed it. In fact, Dr. Figge had never even attempted a VBAC with a woman who had two prior cesareans before Mrs. Schreiber. (Pet. App. D 54a, 55a; R. 96 at 68-69). He had always delivered such children by cesarean.

After Mrs. Schreiber went into labor, two things changed that caused her to reconsider her decision to try a vaginal delivery. First, her labor was following the same course as it had in her first pregnancy, which ended in a cesarean after

36 hours of unproductive labor. (Pet. App. D at 3a). Mrs. Schreiber did not wish to relive that unpleasant experience. Second, early in her labor she began to experience severe upper abdominal pain, unrelated to labor. This pain was so severe that she could not walk without assistance even between contractions. Dr. Figge was unable to diagnose the cause of this pain. (Pet. App. D at 4a; R. 96 at 109-115).

The combination of these two factors caused her to change her mind with respect to her choice for delivering her child. On at least four separate occasions over the course of five hours she communicated her request for a cesarean to Dr. Figge or his staff. (Pet. App. D at 12a). Those requests were ignored or rejected. Finally, Mrs. Schreiber gave up trying to tell Dr. Figge to perform a cesarean, as her attempts were fruitless and she did not know what more she could do. (Pet. App. D at 12a). Dr. Figge ignored her requests because, even though a cesarean was a viable medical option (due to the risk of uterine rupture), he preferred proceeding with the VBAC. (Pet. App. B at 25a, 26a).

Tragically, Mrs. Schreiber's uterus ruptured about two hours after her last unsuccessful attempt to tell Dr. Figge to perform a cesarean. Her daughter, Kimberly, was deprived of oxygen as a result and is now a spastic quadriplegic, unable to speak, move her head or control her body. It is stipulated that had she been born by cesarean at any time prior to the rupture that she would be a healthy and normal child. (Pet. App. D at 5a).

B. The Petition Misstates Some of the Facts of this Case.

In the petitioners' Statement of the Case, there are a number of inaccuracies and misleading statements. While it is the position of the respondents that no constitutional issue would be presented even if the facts as outlined by the petitioners were true, nonetheless, consistent with the requirement of Supreme Court Rule 15, the respondents will point out the inaccuracies.

1. *The petitioners misstate the record when they contend that a VBAC in these circumstances is safer than a cesarean.*

On page 4 of the petition, the petitioners assert that prevailing medical research showed that a VBAC presented less risk than a cesarean. This is simply not an accurate reflection of the record. A fair characterization of the record is as follows. There was literature at the time of Kimberly Schreiber's delivery which indicated that a VBAC could be safely undertaken by a woman who had had a single prior cesarean section. (R. 92 at 26-27). For women who had had two or more prior cesareans, there was not enough clinical data to fully assess the safety. For that reason, the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology recommended that women with one prior cesarean be encouraged to try a VBAC while no such recommendation was made with respect to women who had had two or more prior cesareans. (R. 80: Exhibits 10A-11A). Mrs. Schreiber fell into the latter category. It was known at the time that the risks of a VBAC fall primarily on the fetus, whereas the risks of cesarean tend to put the mother at more risk. (R. 90 at 20-21). In any event, it was undisputed that either procedure was medically acceptable. As was pointed out earlier, this was the first time

Dr. Figge had even attempted a VBAC with a patient who had had two prior cesareans. (R. 96 at 68-69). The normal method of delivery in such patients was a repeat cesarean.

2. *The petitioners misstate the record when they imply that Mrs. Schreiber had digestive pain unrelated to the ultimate rupture of the uterus.*

On page 5 of the petition, the petitioners state that Mrs. Schreiber began experiencing severe upper epigastric pain during labor. This statement may be misleading for two reasons. First, it is important to point out that this pain had nothing to do with labor or contractions. (Pet. App. D at 4a). It was a new severe and disabling pain located at the top of her abdomen. Second, no cause for the pain was ever diagnosed by Dr. Figge. The term epigastric might imply that the pain was digestive in nature, but no proof was ever offered to that effect. Dr. Figge stated that he did not know what caused the pain. (Pet. App. D at 4a). The respondents' experts testified that the pain was an early sign of the beginning of the rupture of the uterus.

3. *The petitioners misstate the record when they assert that a uterine rupture was not occurring at the time Dr. Figge examined Mrs. Schreiber in the early afternoon.*

On page 6 of the petition, the petitioners state that at the time of Dr. Figge's exam a uterine rupture was not occurring. This is somewhat misleading. A frank or catastrophic rupture is always accompanied by obvious symptoms. However, at the beginning of a rupture the only sign or symptom may be pain. The respondents' experts testified that abdominal pain is a danger sign that provides early warning of an impending

catastrophic rupture. (R. 98 at 28-29). While Dr. Figge did not believe that such an early rupture was taking place, he could not rule it out based solely on a clinical exam. (R. 99 at 130-133).

4. *The petitioners misstate the record when they contend that Mrs. Schreiber did not refuse to go forward with the VBAC and that the findings of the supreme court are contrary to the trial court in that regard.*

On page 7 of the petition, the petitioners state that Dr. Figge testified that he thought Mrs. Schreiber had agreed with his plan to continue with the VBAC, and that Mrs. Schreiber did not refuse the treatment. Then on page 13, the petitioners assert that the Supreme Court of Wisconsin made a finding that Mrs. Schreiber had withdrawn her consent to the VBAC contrary to the decision of the circuit court. These contentions are simply not in accord with the record.

The circuit court found that Mrs. Schreiber was denied a choice at 1:00 p.m. (Pet. App. D at 68a, 69a). At the court of appeals level, Dr. Figge attacked this finding and contended that the finding was clearly erroneous. The court of appeals determined that the circuit court's finding was supported by credible evidence and refused to overturn that finding. (Pet. App. B at 32a, 33a). The supreme court affirmed this finding of both the circuit court and the court of appeals by holding that consent was withdrawn.

The supreme court held that a physician has a duty to offer a patient a choice once consent is withdrawn. (Pet. App. A at 13a-15a). It went on to conclude that Mrs. Schreiber's consent was in fact withdrawn, based upon the factual

findings that the circuit court made. (Pet. App. A at 11a-13a). In light of this record, it is simply wrong for the petitioners to state that Mrs. Schreiber consented to the continuation of the VBAC and that the supreme court made this finding contrary to the circuit court.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

I.

THE DECISION OF THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DOES NOT REQUIRE TREATMENT ON DEMAND.

The petition is based entirely upon the petitioners' misreading of the decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The petitioners claim that the court held Dr. Figge liable because he failed to perform a cesarean section, as Mrs. Schreiber requested, and that consequently the effect of the court's decision is to compel physicians to perform a procedure or to provide treatment simply because the patient demands it. The court made no such ruling.

The supreme court held Dr. Figge liable because he failed to conduct an informed consent discussion with Mrs. Schreiber after she withdrew her consent to the VBAC procedure and he thus deprived her of the opportunity to choose a viable treatment option. The court stated:

> Having determined that Janice had withdrawn her consent to the VBAC, we must now examine the effect, if any, of that withdrawal. The Schreibers contend that her withdrawal both removed Figge's authority to continue with the VBAC and obligated him to conduct another informed consent discussion. We agree.

* * *

> This discussion, much like any other such discussion, would have entailed the risks and benefits at that time of the medically viable modes of treatment and again presented her an opportunity to choose her treatment.

(Pet. App. A at 13a). Again, the court stated:

> Consistent with Wis. Stat. § 448.30 Figge had a duty to conduct another informed consent discussion, and should have again presented Janice her treatment options and given her the opportunity to choose. His failure to do so was a violation of that duty.

(Pet. App. A at 17a).

In its summary, the court stated:

> [W]e determine that Janice Schreiber withdrew her consent to a vaginal delivery. Because alternative viable modes of medical treatment existed at that time, her withdrawal constituted a substantial change in circumstances obligating Figge under Wis. Stat. § 448.30 to conduct a new informed consent discussion and affording Janice the opportunity for a choice of treatment.

(Pet. App. A at 20a).

Contrary to the petitioners' assertion that the supreme court's decision will create treatment on demand, the court specifically stated:

> [T]his opinion should not be interpreted as creating a patient's right to demand any treatment she desires. Further, this opinion should not be interpreted as requiring physicians to perform procedures they do not consider medically viable, procedures for which they lack the appropriate expertise, or procedures to which they are morally opposed.

(Pet. App. A at 8a).

It was undisputed that a cesarean section was, in the words of Wis. Stat. § 448.30, a "viable medical mode of treatment" for Janice Schreiber. Consequently, consistent with the statute, Dr. Figge was required to give her the opportunity to choose that treatment option. The supreme court did not hold, as the petitioners assert, that Dr. Figge was required to perform the cesarean section. The court only held that Dr. Figge was required to give Mrs. Schreiber the choice to have a cesarean section. The court found Dr. Figge liable, not because he failed to perform a cesarean section, but because he denied Mrs. Schreiber the opportunity to make a choice of a cesarean section — a viable mode of treatment that she had requested on four separate occasions over the course of five hours. Dr. Figge could have met his obligation under informed consent law by giving Mrs. Schreiber the opportunity to choose her treatment, acknowledging her request for a cesarean section, and either performing the cesarean section himself, just like he had done hundreds of times before, or bringing in another physician to perform

the procedure if he did not want to perform it. Instead, he chose to simply deny her an opportunity to choose a cesarean section because it was not the choice of treatment that he preferred. The supreme court determined that he could not deny Mrs. Schreiber the opportunity to make a choice of a cesarean section simply because he preferred another method of delivery. The court never held that he was obliged to do the cesarean section himself.

Thus, the petitioners' assertion that the court's decision would require a physician to perform or provide whatever procedure or treatment is demanded by the patient does not flow from the court's decision. There is simply nothing in the court's decision which compels a physician to provide a treatment that he/she does not wish to provide or believes is not "indicated" or "appropriate."

It is ironic that the petition asserts that the supreme court's decision would violate Dr. Figge's rights of self-determination when it is his conduct in forcing Mrs. Schreiber to continue with a treatment against her will which forms the basis for the court's decision. The right of the patient to make this choice is one which has long been recognized by courts throughout the nation. *See Bankert v. United States*, 937 F. Supp. 1169 (D. Md. 1996); *Canterbury v. Spence*, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972); *Cobbs v. Grant*, 8 Cal. 3d 229, 502 P.2d 1, 104 Cal. Rptr. 505 (1972); *La Case v. Colier*, 434 So. 2d 1039 (La. 1983); *Natason v. Kline*, 186 Kan. 393, 350 P.2d 1093, 187 Kan. 186, 354 P.2d 670 (1960); *Union Pacific Railroad v. Botsford*, 141 U.S. 250 (1973).

There is absolutely nothing in the supreme court's decision which requires a physician to do anything other than offer patients the right to choose which treatment among

viable alternatives they prefer. To contend otherwise is to ignore the plain language of the decision. Because a physician is not required to do anything under the decision other than offer the patient a choice of treatment, the contention that Dr. Figge's right of self-determination is violated by forcing him to do a procedure that he does not prefer to do is simply unfounded.

II.

THE PETITION DOES NOT RAISE A CONSTITUTIONAL OR FEDERAL QUESTION.

A. The Wisconsin Decision Involves the Application of Wisconsin Statutory Tort Law and Does Not Implicate any Federal Right.

The decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court is based solely on the Wisconsin informed consent statute, Wis. Stat. § 448.30. It does not involve the application of any federal law or statute. Because the decision does not compel a physician to provide patients with treatment on demand, there is no reasonable argument that it implicates any federal right. This case is simply a matter of Wisconsin tort law and should be left to the jurisdiction of the Wisconsin courts.

B. The Right of Bodily Integrity and/or Self-Determination Is Not Applicable to this Situation.

The constitutional right claimed by the petitioners is one of self-determination and/or bodily integrity grounded in the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The decisions cited by the petitioners are all cases which

involve the right to control one's own body.[1] The petitioners do not cite a single case in support of the proposition that the Fourteenth Amendment would prohibit reasonable laws which would compel individuals to take action, sometimes actions that they might not like or agree with. For instance, the Wisconsin informed consent statute, Wis. Stat. § 448.30, requires a physician provide a patient with information concerning alternate modes of medical treatment. If a physician believes that he should be able to make a medical judgment for the patient, he may disagree with the provisions of the statute. To claim, however, that he has a constitutional right to violate the statute because he disagrees is unfounded. No reasonable construction of the Fourteenth Amendment or the case law interpreting it would support such a conclusion.

---

1. *See Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health*, 497 U.S. 261 (1990), involving the rights of a vegetative child whom the parents wish to terminate life supports; *Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651 (1977), involving whether a child can be subject to certain corporal punishment at school; *Rust v Sullivan*, 500 U.S. 173 (1991), involving abortion rights; *Winston v. Lee*, 470 U.S. 753 (1985), involving the issue of whether or not a criminal defendant can be compelled to undergo surgery to remove a bullet which might be used for evidence; *Schmerber v. California*, 384 U.S. 757 (1966), whether blood can be taken against the consent of an accused; *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), involving abortion rights; *Canterbury v. Spence*, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972), involving the informed consent rights of a patient; *Hurtado v. People of California*, 110 U.S. 516 (1884), involving the rights of a criminal defendant; *Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 416 (1983), involving the reproductive rights of a woman; *Washington v. Harper*, 494 U.S. 210 (1990), involving whether a criminal inmate can be forced to take psychotropic drugs; *Maher v. Roe*, 432 U.S. 464 (1977), involving a challenge to a regulation that limits Medicaid payments relating to abortions.

Clearly, the states have a legitimate interest in passing laws which would dictate how certain medical procedures are to be handled. Certainly, the states have the right to require physicians to treat patients in certain ways if the state decides that such laws meet the public interest. While the patient has a constitutional right to decide whether or not to receive that treatment, the physician has no constitutional right to violate those rules simply because he may disagree.

In any event, the issue is moot here because the decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court simply does not compel a physician to provide any specific mode of treatment. The decision merely requires the physician to outline the viable treatment alternatives so that the patient has the right and ability to exercise the constitutional right to control his/her body. In essence, the decision requires a discussion, followed by the right of the patient to make the choice. It does not compel the physician to do the treatment; instead, it prohibits the physician from forcing the patient to follow a treatment protocol against his/her wishes.

III.

THE WISCONSIN COURT'S DECISION DOES NOT PUT PHYSICIANS AT RISK FOR MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CLAIMS.

The petitioners argue that the supreme court's decision subjects a physician like Dr. Figge to medical malpractice liability. The petitioners claim that, on the one hand, if a physician fails to provide a viable treatment requested by the patient, because the physician believes that the treatment is not "indicated," the physician will be subject to liability under the supreme court's decision. On the other hand, the

petitioners argue, if the physician accedes to the patient's request and there is a negative outcome, traditional malpractice liability may attach. The petitioners argue that physicians should not be subject to liability under the informed consent doctrine for failing to provide a viable treatment that they felt was not indicated. The petitioners also argue that physicians should not be subject to liability for malpractice when they provide a treatment which, although viable, is not "indicated." These arguments have no merit.

First, as explained above, the court's decision does not require a physician to provide a treatment which is requested by a patient. The decision only requires a physician to give the patient the opportunity to choose among viable treatments. Since all of the petitioners' arguments stem from the petitioners' erroneous assertion that the court's decision compels a physician to provide treatment requested by a patient, even if the physician feels the treatment is not "indicated," those arguments must be rejected.

Second, if a physician provides a treatment, his/her conduct should be judged by principles of negligence and informed consent, just as the conduct would have been judged prior to the court's decision in this case. If the treatment is a viable medical mode of treatment and it is provided with reasonable care, the physician is not subject to liability. *See* Wis. J.I. — Civil 1023. If the physician provides the treatment negligently, he/she should be subject to malpractice liability like any other physician who commits negligence.

Third, the petitioners' position that a patient should only be permitted to choose among "indicated" methods of treatment, but not all viable modes of treatment, is contrary to the clear and direct language of Wis. Stat. § 448.30 and case law interpreting that statute.

The petitioners' argument that a physician should not be required to give a patient the choice of a viable mode of treatment which is not "indicated" is a radical departure from existing Wisconsin law. The term "indicated" treatment, as used by the petitioners, is nothing but a shorthand phrase meaning the treatment that the physician feels is preferable. It cannot possibility mean anything else. This is so because the petitioners admit that the term "viable" is broader than the term "indicated," and the term "viable" is legally defined to mean "modes of treatment generally considered by the medical profession to be within the scope of current, acceptable standards of care." Wis. Admin. Code, sec. Med 18.02(3). If a "viable" mode of treatment is one which is within the standard of care for a physician to provide, then an "indicated" treatment is that treatment which, among the alternatives within the standard of care, the physician prefers. Under the petitioners' argument, a physician could be held liable only for failing to give a patient the choice of "indicated" treatments, but could not be held liable for failing to give a patient the choice of a viable mode of treatment which is not "indicated."

This argument is directly contrary to the language of Wis. Stat. § 448.30. That statute provides that a physician "shall inform the patient about the availability of all alternate, *viable* medical modes of treatment." (Emphasis added). The essence of the informed consent doctrine is that the patient has a right to make a reasonably informed choice of the method of treatment. If a physician is required under the statute to inform a patient about all viable modes of treatment, it necessarily follows that the patient has the right to choose from among those modes of treatment.

The notion that a physician's preferences should be permitted to dictate a patient's choice of treatment was rejected by the Wisconsin Supreme Court even before Wis. Stat. § 448.30 was enacted. *See Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 68 Wis. 2d 1, 12, 227 N.W.2d 647 (1975). This was confirmed in *Martin v. Richards*, 192 Wis. 2d 156, 174, 531 N.W.2d 70 (1995), where the court stated that "the court in *Scaria* recognized that the standard for informed consent cannot be defined by the medical profession. The decision is not a medical decision."

The petitioners' argument that a physician should not be required to give a patient the choice of a viable mode of treatment which is not "indicated" is contrary to Wisconsin informed consent law. It is axiomatic under that law that a patient has the right to choose among alternate medical modes of treatment that are within the standard of care. There is nothing in the common law or Wis. Stat. § 448.30 that would limit a patient's choice to alternatives that the physician preferred. As Wis. Admin. Code sec. Med 18.03 points out, a physician can "recommend" the treatment that he/she prefers, but cannot dictate it. A standard that would allow for a patient's choice of only the alternatives that the physician felt were "indicated" or preferred would clearly violate § 448.30 and, in fact, would violate the patients right of self determination, the very right claimed by the petitioners here.

When boiled down to its simplest terms, the position of the petitioners simply does not make sense. If a treatment is within the standard of care, it is viable, and the patient must be informed about it. A physician must give a patient the choice of that treatment. If a treatment is outside the standard of care, it need not be disclosed or offered. If among the

treatments that are within the standard of care there is a difference between the patient and the physician as to which treatment is preferred or, in the terms of the petitioners, "indicated," then the patient's wishes prevail. The position of petitioners would radically alter this simple and long-standing rule.

Not only do the petitioners contend that a physician should not be liable under the Wisconsin informed consent doctrine for failing to give a patient the choice of a method of treatment which is viable but not "indicated," but the petitioners are concerned that if a physician provides a treatment which is viable, but not "indicated," the physician may be subject to liability for malpractice. The simple answer to this concern is that if a physician provides the treatment negligently, then he/she should be held subject to liability for malpractice. If the physician provides the treatment with reasonable care, then he/she cannot be subject to liability merely for providing the treatment. By definition, a "viable" mode of treatment is one which is within the standard of care for a physician to provide. Therefore, a physician cannot be held to have violated the standard of care merely for providing the treatment. *See* Wis.J.I. — Civil 1023.

IV.

THE MEDICAL EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY THE PETITIONERS DO NOT PROPERLY REFLECT THE RULING OF THE WISCONSIN COURT.

In erroneously arguing that the Wisconsin court's decision compels a physician to perform whatever procedure is demanded, the petitioners cite two hypothetical fact situations in an attempt to make that point. An examination

of those situations clearly shows that the petitioners have not properly applied the court's decision.

First, the petitioners create a fact situation where a patient with coronary artery blockage is faced with a decision involving three potential treatments: angioplasty, bypass surgery and medication. The petitioners state that all three therapies may be "indicated" for one patient, but that for another patient, the surgery alternative might be the only "indicated" treatment. The petitioners then ask whether this latter patient should have the right to demand the medication alternative. The petitioners further ask whether the physician will be subject to liability if the physician accedes to the patient's request and administers the medication and the patient develops complications which are a known risk of the medication. The answer is simple. If treatment with the medication is a viable mode of treatment, and the physician informs the patient of the risks and benefits of the medication, as required by Wis. Stat. § 448.30, then the physician cannot be held liable under the informed consent doctrine. If the physician acts with reasonable care in administering the medication, the physician cannot be held liable for malpractice. Wis.J.I — Civil 1023. The court's decision in this case does not have any effect on those conclusions.

If treatment with the medication is a viable mode of treatment, then clearly the patient has the right to choose that treatment, whether or not the physician feels that this treatment is preferred or "indicated." That is the essence of the informed consent doctrine. The doctrine has nothing to do with whether the medication is administered by the physician who informs the patient about the medication or by some other physician. The doctrine is concerned with who has the right to make the choice of that treatment. The

supreme court's decision in this case, along with all Wisconsin cases preceding it and Wis. Stat. § 448.30, vest that right with the patient.

A physician has no fear of being sued for malpractice if the patient selects one viable medical mode of treatment, even if the physician recommends a different course of treatment which is also a viable mode of treatment. If the treatment is within the standard of care, then the physician has a clear defense to any claim for malpractice, because a physician cannot be found negligent for administering a recognized alternative method of treatment. Wis.J.I. — Civil 1023. If the treatment is not a viable treatment, the physician should not be offering it. If it is, the patient has the right to choose it, and the physician cannot be liable for providing it.

The second example provided by the petitioners is likewise misguided. It involves a patient who has an abnormal mammogram and then requests a biopsy for "peace of mind." The petitioners argue that a complication from the biopsy could then result in the physician being sued for malpractice for performing a "contraindicated" biopsy. Again, this situation is not difficult to analyze. The physician has no obligation to even offer, much less perform a biopsy, unless it is within the standard of care. If it is, then the patient has the right to select it, even if the physician feels that it is not the preferred or "indicated" method of treatment. If the patient does select the biopsy against the recommendation of the physician, the physician is completely protected from a negligence claim, as long as he performs the procedure with reasonable care.

In this case, there was no dispute that a cesarean section was not only within the standard of care, it was the normal method of delivery for a woman like Janice Schreiber who had had two prior cesarean sections. It was undisputed that because of her two prior cesarean sections, she had to be given the choice of a third cesarean section. It was undisputed that such an option was well within the standard of care, due to the risk of uterine rupture which a VBAC presents. It was undisputed that no one could be critical of Dr. Figge for performing a cesarean section. To argue that Dr. Figge should have the right to deny Mrs. Schreiber the choice of this typically-used alternative merely because he preferred a VBAC is to wholly reject the informed consent doctrine.

V.

THE POSITION ADVOCATED BY THE PETITIONERS WOULD RESULT IN THE VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MEDICAL PATIENTS.

The decision of the Wisconsin court is based directly on the Wisconsin informed consent statute, Wis. Stat. § 448.30. That statute has its roots in both Wisconsin and United States Supreme Court case law which predated the passage of the statute. That case law stands for the proposition that a hallowed right vested in the United States Constitution is the right to control one's own body. The right to control one's own medical treatment, even if some would consider the decision to be unwise, is a constitutionally vested right belonging to any medical patient in this country.

The position advocated by the petitioners would eviscerate that longstanding right by allowing a physician

to continue a treatment that a patient wanted to end. No reasonable construction of the cases supporting the self-determination right of a patient could possibly be read to delegate that cherished right to a physician.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

D. JAMES WEIS
Counsel of Record
VIRGINIA M. ANTOINE
HABUSH, HABUSH, DAVIS
& ROTTIER, S.C.
Attorneys for Respondents
26 South Brown Street
Rhinelander, Wisconsin 54501
(715) 365-1900

APPENDIX

APPENDIX — WISCONSIN ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SEC. MED 18.02 & 18.03

Med 18.02 Definitions. (1) "Emergency" means a circumstance in which there is an immediate risk to a patient's life, body part or function which demands prompt action by a physician.

(2) "Experimental treatment" means a mode of treatment which has not been generally adopted by the medical profession.

(3) "Viable" as used in s. 448.30, Stats., to modify the term, "medical modes of treatment" means modes of treatment generally considered by the medical profession to be within the scope of current, acceptable standards of care.

Med. 1803. Communication of alternate modes of treatment. (1) It is the obligation of a physician to communicate alternate viable modes of treatment to a patient. The communication shall include the nature of the recommended treatment, alternate viable treatments, and risks or complications of the proposed treatment, sufficient to allow the patient to make a prudent decision. In the communication with a patient, a physician shall take into consideration:

(a) A patient's ability to understand the information;

(b) The emotional state of a patient; and,

(c) The physical state of a patient,

(2) Nothing in sub. (1) shall be construed as preventing or limiting a physician in recommending a mode of treatment which is in his or her judgment the best treatment for a patient.

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG
CLERK

No. 99-28

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

PHYSICIANS INSURANCE COMPANY OF WISCONSIN; PAUL K.H. FIGGE, JR., M.D.; WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND,

Petitioners,

v.

KIMBERLY SCHREIBER, a minor by her guardian ad litem, JOHN KRUEGER; GERALD SCHREIBER and JANICE SCHREIBER,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER WISCONSIN PATIENTS COMPENSATION FUND

TIMOTHY J. STRATTNER
Counsel of Record
PAUL J. KELLY
LINDA V. MEAGHER
SCHELLINGER & DOYLE, S.C.
Attorneys for Petitioner Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund
445 South Moorland Road
Suite 450
P.O. Box 464
Brookfield, WI 53008
(414) 785-0200

154845

Counsel Press LLC
FORMERLY LUTZ APPELLATE SERVICES
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

13 pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Cited Authorities	ii
Argument	1
I. Doctors, Like Their Patients, Are Entitled To Exercise Their Right Of Self-Determination.	2
A. Dr. Figge Did Not Prefer Proceeding with the VBAC Instead of Performing a Cesarean.	2
B. Wisconsin Doctors are At Risk of Violating Either the Informed Consent Law or Committing Malpractice.	4
II. The Wisconsin Supreme Court Decision Violates The Rights Of Wisconsin Doctors.	6
A. The Cautionary Note Does Not Protect Wisconsin Doctors.	6
B. Section 448.30 Does Not Require Two Discussions.	8
Conclusion	10

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Cruzan v. Harmon, 760 S.W.2d 408 (Mo. 1988) .. 1

Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990) 1

Hurtado v. People of California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884) 1

In re Gardner, 534 A. 2d 947 (Me. 1987) 1

Statute:

Wis. Stat. sec. 448.30 ..... 8, 9

United States Constitution:

Fourteenth Amendment 1, 2, 10

In this appeal, the Court is being asked to decide whether or not a doctor, just like his or her patient, is entitled to a right of self-determination protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. If the decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court is not reversed, Wisconsin physicians will be forced to provide treatment on demand for their patients, even in circumstances where the doctor, under his medical judgment, does not believe that the treatment demanded is required, necessary, or proper. The decision forces doctors to physically provide treatment that they do not want to provide. It places doctors in a Catch 22 situation, having to chose between committing medical malpractice or violating the informed consent law created by the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in this case. Review by the Supreme Court is necessary to protect the constitutional rights of Wisconsin doctors.

ARGUMENT

The right of self-determination has long-standing importance in this country's Anglo-American tradition. *In re Gardner*, 534 A. 2d 947, 950 (Me. 1987). "The right of self-determination and individual autonomy has its roots deep in our history." *Cruzan v. Harmon*, 760 S.W.2d 408, 416 n.11 (Mo. 1988). The right to self-determination is a liberty interest protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Hurtado v. People of California*, 110 U.S. 516, 536 (1884). *See also Cruzan v. Missouri Dep't of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 269 (1990).

I. DOCTORS, LIKE THEIR PATIENTS, ARE ENTITLED TO EXERCISE THEIR RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION.

The respondents do not deny that there is a constitutionally protected right to self-determination. Instead, they argue that only the patient, and not his or her doctor, possesses such a right. This interpretation of Fourteenth Amendment cannot be correct. A doctor should not be physically forced to perform procedures or treatments against his or her will.

The purpose of the informed consent law is to make sure a patient understands all of the risks and benefits associated with a particular treatment before agreeing to proceed with it. In this case, it is undisputed that Janice Schreiber gave her informed consent for the VBAC before she went into labor, and the treatment began. After the treatment started, Dr. Figge was under an obligation to proceed with the chosen course, unless something in Mrs. Schreiber's medical condition changed. Here, nothing changed. There were no medical symptoms that would have supported Dr. Figge performing a cesarean. It is not surprising that the plaintiffs dismissed their medical malpractice claim against Dr. Figge before trial began. *See* Pet. App. D at 50a. Dr. Figge's decision to proceed with the VBAC, because there was no medical condition to support performing a cesarean, was within the standard of care.

A. Dr. Figge Did Not Prefer Proceeding with the VBAC Instead of Performing a Cesarean.

Throughout their brief, the respondents state that Dr. Figge simply "preferred" the VBAC delivery over the cesarean, which is why Dr. Figge did not perform the cesarean when Mrs. Schreiber requested the procedure.

("Dr. Figge ignored her requests because . . . he *preferred* proceeding with the VBAC." *See* respondents' brief at 2 (emphasis added). *See also id* at. 9 and 15.) Respondents argue that Dr. Figge had done hundreds of cesareans before but, they imply, on the day of Mrs. Schreiber's delivery he just did not feel like performing a cesarean. That is an unfair depiction of what occurred.

To say that Dr. Figge proceeded with the VBAC because he "preferred" that treatment over the cesarean, implies that Dr. Figge did not care about his patient and that he did not evaluate his patient's medical condition at that point in time. The fact of the matter is that Janice Schreiber, and not Dr. Figge, chose the VBAC. Before her labor began, Mrs. Schreiber made the informed decision to proceed with the VBAC. At that time, she knew that she had already had two cesareans before, yet she still wanted to proceed with the VBAC. Before she chose the VBAC option, Mrs. Schreiber also knew all of the risks associated with that option. Moreover, Mrs. Schreiber, when deciding to proceed with the VBAC, knew that she could experience a long and difficult labor, since she had experienced 36 hours of unproductive labor during a prior delivery. Pet. App. D at 3a . Despite knowing all of this first hand, Mrs. Schreiber made the informed decision to proceed with the VBAC delivery. Dr. Figge proceeded with the chosen course and evaluated Mrs. Schreiber in accordance with the choice made. Nothing about her medical condition changed, which would have required a second discussion about the viable options. Mrs. Schreiber already knew the risks related to the labor process, including a lengthly, painful labor. Moreover, there were no medical symptoms that would support a decision to perform a cesarean.

Clearly, it probably would have been Dr. Figge's preference to perform a cesarean. It would have been faster, and Dr. Figge probably would have made more money from the procedure. However, Dr. Figge's preference has no relevance here. It also had no relevance in Dr. Figge's treatment of Janice Schreiber. Dr. Figge was providing treatment based upon the standard of care for a VBAC delivery. Dr. Figge had a duty to evaluate his patient at the point in time of the treatment and to deliver the treatment chosen by the patient. Once treatment began, which means once Mrs. Schreiber went into labor, Dr. Figge had to proceed in accordance with his medical judgment.

As one expert testified at trial, women ask for cesareans "with great regularity" during labor. (R. 100 at 45, 173-74). They also ask for sterilization. These demands are associated with the pain of labor and not the medical judgment of whether a cesarean, or sterilization, are proper at that point.

Respondents suggest that all Dr. Figge had to do was stop and give Mrs. Schreiber her options again, when she requested the cesarean. That cannot be the law. If it is the law, then all doctors who deliver babies will have to perform a cesarean each and every time a patient demands it during the labor and delivery process, even if there is no basis for it. (At the same time, the doctors will be subjected to a potential medical malpractice action should there be a complication during the cesarean).

B. Wisconsin Doctors are At Risk of Violating Either the Informed Consent Law or Committing Malpractice.

Respondents argue that a doctor is not at risk of violating either the informed consent law or committing malpractice, when the doctor is forced to perform the patient demanded

procedure. Respondents contend that "[i]f the physician provides the treatment with reasonable care, then he/she cannot be subject to liability merely for providing the treatment." *See* respondents' brief at 16. The respondents are wrong, and their position overly simplifies the problem. The reality is that if a doctor performs a procedure that is not medically indicated given the patient's medical condition, and something goes wrong during the procedure, even if it is a known complication, the doctor will be exposed to a malpractice lawsuit. The doctor will be criticized for performing the procedure when it was not medically appropriate under the circumstances presented at the time.

The respondents suggest that the fact that Dr. Figge had performed cesareans "hundreds of times before" Mrs. Schreiber's delivery is somehow relevant. Dr. Figge's experience with performing cesareans has nothing to do with whether Mrs. Schreiber's medical condition required the procedure. *See* Respondents' brief at 8.

Respondents also argue that if Dr. Figge did not want to do the cesarean he should have brought in another doctor to perform the procedure. That also cannot be the law. (Even assuming that another doctor could be found who would perform a cesarean based solely on the patient's demand). Dr. Figge, as the doctor performing the procedure selected by Mrs. Schreiber, evaluated Mrs. Schreiber and made the medical decision that there was no basis for performing a cesarean. No one criticized Dr. Figge for that medical decision. Instead, he was criticized for not explaining the options again to Mrs. Schreiber and then performing the procedure demanded by Mrs. Schreiber, against his medical judgment. The law in Wisconsin now requires a doctor to search for and find another doctor to perform a treatment that the original doctor does not deem appropriate, while the original doctor is in the midst of providing the treatment selected by his or her patient. For example, if a patient

selects that he receive stitches in his finger, instead of amputation, but then screams out during the stitching that he wants his finger cut off, does the doctor have to find a doctor to amputate?

II. THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISION VIOLATES THE RIGHTS OF WISCONSIN DOCTORS.

To comply with the decision issued by the Wisconsin Supreme Court in this case, doctors must yield to the patient's demand during treatment. Doctors will be forced to physically provide treatment that they deem unnecessary, improper or not required. The decision violates Dr. Figge's right to self-determination and it will, in the future, violate the rights of other doctors.

A. The Cautionary Note Does Not Protect Wisconsin Doctors.

Respondents also argue that this case will not require treatment on demand, since the Wisconsin Supreme Court included a comment in its decision saying that "the opinion should not be interpreted as creating a patient's right to demand any treatment she desires." *See* Pet. App. A at 8a. Despite the cautionary note, the reality is that treatment on demand is precisely the result of the decision. There can be no other interpretation. Mrs. Schreiber's medical condition did not require a cesarean, but Dr. Figge has been found liable in this case because he did not heed his patient's demand. (If a woman in labor yells out that she wants to be sterilized, the doctor better perform the treatment, even if the patient before labor decided against sterilization, and even though the doctor believes that such a treatment is not medically warranted and the patient's demand is probably related to the labor itself).

Given the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision here, doctors will have to perform the cesarean or face being sued for a violation of Wisconsin's informed consent law. At the same time, Wisconsin doctors can expect to be criticized by the patient's health insurance company for performing an unwarranted treatment. Should anything go wrong during the demanded cesarean, the doctor should also be ready for a medical malpractice lawsuit, because the doctor performed a procedure without any basis for it.

It is the respondents' position that the Wisconsin Supreme Court "held Dr. Figge liable because he failed to conduct an informed consent discussion with Mrs. Schreiber after she withdrew her consent to the VBAC procedure and he thus deprived her of the opportunity to choose a viable treatment option." Respondents' brief at 6. They claim that Dr. Figge was not held liable because he failed to perform the cesarean at Mrs. Schreiber's request. *Id.* In fact, however, there is no difference between the two descriptions, in a case where the treatment has already begun, and the doctor is providing treatment based upon the course selected by the patient. If a patient demands a treatment other than the treatment previously selected and the treatment that is being provided, the effect is that the doctor must switch to the new treatment demanded, regardless of the consequences and regardless of whether the doctor believes that the treatment demanded at that point is proper. The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision requires the doctor to physically perform the treatment demanded, and it eliminates the doctors' right to self-determination.

B. Section 448.30 Does Not Require Two Discussions.

Respondents also argue that Dr. Figge should have told Mrs. Schreiber, at the point that she demanded the cesarean, the risks and benefits of the options. The respondents fail to mention that the discussion would have been no different than the discussion that Dr. Figge had with Mrs. Schreiber before Mrs. Schreiber went into labor and before Mrs. Schreiber made the informed decision to proceed with the VBAC.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision makes practicing medicine in Wisconsin like walking through a mine field. Doctors no longer have a right to self-determination. They must physically perform procedures demanded by their patients, despite the serious consequences.

Respondents argue this case involves only the application of sec. 448.30, Wis. Stats. *See* respondents' brief at 10. This case is not that simple. In this case, Dr. Figge followed sec. 448.30 and provided Mrs. Schreiber with all of the information necessary to give an informed consent, before the treatment began. She made a choice with regards to the viable options. Once treatment began, Dr. Figge was under an obligation to treat Mrs. Schreiber as he would treat any other patient proceeding with a VBAC. Section 448.30 does not require a doctor to have a second informed consent discussion with his/her patient during the treatment selected by the patient. Nothing changed about Mrs. Schreiber's condition that required a second discussion, except that she was demanding a specific treatment for which there was no medical indication. The petitioners are not asking that doctors be given a constitutional right to violate sec. 448.30, as respondents suggest. *See* respondents' brief at 11. Instead, the petitioners are asking that Wisconsin doctors be given the right to exercise their right of self-determination.

Doctors should not be forced to physically perform a treatment or procedure that the doctor does not believe is medically proper at that time.

In this case, Dr. Figge complied with sec. 448.30, Wis. Stats., yet he was still found liable under the doctrine of informed consent. The only reason he was found liable was because he did not provide the form of treatment demanded by the patient, in the middle of the treatment the patient had selected. Section 448.30 does not require that a doctor, in the middle of the treatment selected by the patient, to have a second discussion with the patient, when nothing has changed from the first discussion.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision will have far reaching effect in the practice of medicine in the future in Wisconsin. The opinion strips Wisconsin doctors of their right of self-determination in the practice of medicine and places doctors at the mercy of their patients' demands during the treatment process.

CONCLUSION

The petitioners respectfully request that this Court grant their Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The Wisconsin Supreme Court opinion in this case violates Dr. Figge's right to self-determination, which is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. It eliminates a Wisconsin doctor's right to his or her own bodily integrity, because it forces a doctor to perform treatment on demand, against his or her own medical judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY J. STRATTNER
Counsel of Record
PAUL J. KELLY
LINDA V. MEAGHER
SCHELLINGER & DOYLE, S.C.
Attorneys for Petitioner
Wisconsin Patients
Compensation Fund
445 South Moorland Road
Suite 450
P.O. Box 464
Brookfield, WI 53008
(414) 785-0200